The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1899.

The Week.

The ultimate ratification of the treaty between the United States and Spain was insured when the results of the elections of last November became known. Through those elections the Republicans made such gains in the United States Senate that, after the 4th of March next, they will have a good majority in that branch; and with the help of Democrats who had favored ratification, a two-thirds vote was certain in case the issue should be pushed over to an extra session. The only question was whether ratification should come before or after the 4th of March. The vote proved to be almost as close as possible to the limit of success. Eighty-four Senators recorded themselves; fifty-six yeas were necessary, and fifty-seven were given. The majority could have lost one, and still have carried their point; but they could not have spared both of the two Southern Democrats who went over to them at the last moment. The new complications created by the collisions between the American forces and the Filipinos under Aguinaldo which began on Saturday night, served as an excuse for the change of position which Messrs. McLaurin of Mississippi and McEnery of Louisiana made just before the vote was taken. Had there been no change in the situation at Manila, the friends of the treaty might have been forced to ask a reconsideration and push the final action over until after the 4th of March. The ratification was due to the conclusion by Senators of character, ability, and independence, who regret that we ever got involved in the Philippines and who oppose the policy of conquest, that they ought to vote for it. The best representative of this class is Senator Spooner of Wisconsin, who is so much against expansion that he opposed the annexation of Hawaii last summer, and whose courage would have enabled him to stand with Messrs. Hoar of Massachusetts and Hale of Maine on Monday if his judgment had agreed with theirs. His speech of last week was the strongest plea for the treaty that has been made, because of the candor and independence which characterized it.

The treaty is not yet the supreme law of the land, as Spain must first ratify it. That she will do so promptly admits of no doubt. Not only is she a weak and conquered nation that must submit to the terms of the victor, but she has every motive of self-interest to bring the matter to a close at the earliest possible date. After what we have found out about the Philippines, who supposes that Spain would take them from us now as a gift, if she had to subdue and govern them? The truth is that Spain jumped at the chance, offered her by the war, to rid herself of what was rapidly becoming, without the war, an intolerable burden. Of course, her Commissioners at Paris made as stiff a fight for the Philippines as was possible when in their hearts they knew that their own country wanted to get rid of them for ever. They would gladly have stipulated for much more than $20,000,000. But when they found our one formidable editor-diplomat unyielding, they secretly thanked God that they had got as much out of him as they did before he discovered how bad a bargain he had made in buying an insurrection. Spain has already abolished her Ministry for the Colonies. Whatever future fate has in store for her will be enacted within the Peninsula. To this all parties and all sections of the country and the army itself are now agreed; and the ratification of the treaty is only a remaining form.

Some of the baser newspapers are using left-over war headlines to describe the hideous affair with the Filipinos, but we are glad to observe not the slightest sign of popular approval of this attempt to make a battle out of a battue. Americans have not yet got to the point of rejoicing at the sight of natives armed only with bows and arrows marching bravely up to be cut down, like so much standing grain, by machinery. The news from Manila undoubtedly came as a cold douche to most people in this country. They never dreamed of succeeding so soon to the Spanish in the Philippines in the rôle of hated oppressors. In our good-natured and shifty American way we were going somehow to "manage" the islanders. Well, it seems the poor fellows do not want to be managed, and will fight us and be killed by us, just as if we were but so many Spaniards. Of course, they listened to leaders who have shown incredible folly. The only comfort we have in our general sense of mortification at the frightful loss of life is that it did not result from direct aggression by our forces. Our soldiers were attacked, and could only play the game of war through to the bitter end, as, of course, they did, bravely and efficiently. But the country is sick at heart of this kind of glory. More than ever should our policy at Manila now be one of forbearance and conciliation. If the slaughter grew out of a misunderstanding of our character on the part of the natives, let us undeceive them by caring for their wounded and telling those who are prisoners to go home and go to work, and in all ways preparing their minds for the coming of our college presidents and missionaries. The welcome of these last would seem to be endangered by the work of our machine guns. As a *Præparatio Evangelica*, a rapid-fire battery is a modern improvement that would have made Eusebius wonder.

It is universally admitted in Washington that the Hull bill, which passed the House on Tuesday week, cannot obtain a favorable vote in the Senate during the present session. Created in the noxious atmosphere of the staff departments, for their especial benefit, without providing for a single military reform or a single scientific advance, and made and remade while under discussion on the floor of the House, it furnishes a striking example of careless and vicious legislation. The inability of the Republicans themselves to fasten upon the country so foreign and dangerous an institution as a large standing army has been the real cause of its defeat in what seems to be the hour of its victory, and the importance of the defeat lies in the fact that without a large standing army imperialism cannot exist. The military problem presented by the failure of the bill is serious indeed. With more and more volunteers being discharged, the clamor of the remainder for release from garrison duty increases, while the mustering-out of the regular soldiers who enlisted for the war only would reduce the permanent army by about 20,000 men. Where are their successors to come from?

The unanimous action of the House in adopting an amendment to the army bill which abolishes the army canteen and forbids the sale of liquor in any camp or post of the United States, formulates a conclusion towards which impartial students of the problems involved have been drifting for some time. The canteen is a place where the lighter kinds of "drinks" are sold, under the regulation of the authorities and without the incentive that the ordinary saloonkeeper has to promote excess in order to help his business. The argument for this institution has been that drinking could not be entirely prohibited, and that there would be less drunkenness if the Government allowed the soldiers to buy beer in camp than if they were tempted to go outside for whiskey. This seemed plausible, and a good many army officers were at first inclined to endorse the system. But the experience of the recent war furnished overwhelming evidence for the opponents of the canteen. Each colonel was allowed to establish a canteen or prohibit it, and in Florida, in Cuba, and in the Philippines alike those regiments which were forbidden it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not only suffered much less from drunkenness than the others, but had by far the smallest percentage of sickness and death from disease. Every general in the army who has expressed an opinion now opposes the canteen, except one—and his dissent is the strongest argument on the side of the majority, for he is Eagan.

The experience of our army only duplicates that of England in showing that soldiers who do not drink intoxicating liquor are far more efficient, and far less subject to disease and death, than those who do. Experiments were made with three regiments from each of several brigades in the British army at different times, and in several instances where forced marches and other hard work were required. In one, every man was forbidden to drink a drop while the test lasted; in the second, malt liquor only could be purchased; in the third, a sailor's ration of whiskey was given to each man. The whiskey-drinkers manifested more dash at first, but generally in about four days showed signs of lassitude and abnormal fatigue; those given malt liquor displayed less dash at first, but their endurance lasted somewhat longer; while the abstainers improved daily in alertness and staying powers. As a result, the War Department decided that in the Sudan campaign not a single drop of stimulant should be allowed in camp, save for hospital use. The officers, including even the generals, were forbidden the accustomed spirits, wines, and malt liquors at their mess-tables, and an order was issued that the liquid refreshment for all hands, including even camp-followers, must be limited to tea, oatmeal water, or lime juice and Nile water. The wonderful freedom of the Kitchener expedition from disease, although making forced marches through the desert under a burning sun and in a most unhealthy climate, fully justified the new rule. The truth is, that the requirement of abstinence from intoxicating liquors for soldiers is only the application to the army of a principle which is coming to be generally accepted in industrial life, that men occupying responsible positions, like locomotive engineers, motormen on trolley-cars, and men in charge of delicate machinery, must be men who are never in danger of getting drunk.

The capacity of the Democratic party, or rather of the Bryanites, for folly was again illustrated in the House when their votes were cast for a proposed amendment to the army bill providing that "no part of the army shall be used for, or shall do the duty of, a posse comitatus, or be employed in putting down strikes or riots, or do any police duty whatever in any State in this Union, except upon the application of the Legislature or of the Executive of such State (when the Legislature cannot be convened) in accordance with section 4, article iv. of the Constitution of the United States." The object of this amendment, as was explained by its chief advocate, was to prevent any President in future from imitating the example set by Mr. Cleveland during the Chicago strike riots in 1894. The Anarchist Governor of Illinois having then refused either to restore order himself or to ask the assistance of the Federal authorities, President Cleveland acted upon his own initiative, and sent a force of the regular army, which soon put an end to a situation that had become a national disgrace. This action was warmly approved at the time by the whole nation, without distinction of party, Southern Democrats rivalling Northern Republicans in their commendation of the new rule of constitutional construction thus established. The condemnation of the precedent now by Congressmen who call themselves Democrats, only shows how Bryanism has driven brains and principles out of the party.

The easy passage through the House last week of the most extravagant river and harbor bill ever known furnishes fresh evidence of the nonchalance with which Congressmen nowadays vote away public money by the tens of millions of dollars. The bill carries something over $30,000,000, and the Representative who had it in charge asked unanimous consent that general debate be limited to half an hour! He was evidently surprised that anybody should want more than thirty minutes for thirty millions, but one Iowa Representative suggested that there ought to be at least an hour, and then another insisted that even an hour was not enough to discuss the principles which underlie such a measure. An allowance of ninety minutes was at last made, the friends of discussion being assured that further debate would be allowed when the bill was taken up by items. But discussion produced no effect, whether devoted to general principles or to specific exposures of particular wastes of money, like the expenditure of $1,500,000 on the improvement of the Muskingum River in Ohio during the last dozen years, the commerce meanwhile having fallen off almost to nothing. Every effort to amend the bill in the public interest failed, and only seven votes were cast against its passage—the smallest minority ever recorded on such a measure.

It must be said for the alternative Nicaragua Canal bill reported on Saturday by the House committee as a substitute for the Senate bill, that it is at least a more direct and honest measure than the nondescript affair which Senators voted in order to rid themselves of a disagreeable business. The House bill brushes aside all the nonsense about paying the Maritime Company for its good will, and about guaranteeing bonds, and comes straight to the point by appropriating the money outright from the Treasury. That is where it would have to come from eventually, and it is honest to say so in the beginning. But there are grave defects in the House bill, quite apart from all questions of policy and cost. The President is, under its terms, to purchase from Nicaragua and Costa Rica the land necessary to build the canal and to "defend" it. Here is difficulty number one. Nicaragua has expressly said that she would never alienate any of her territory for the purpose of an interoceanic canal. It was because the committee was plainly informed of this that it struck out the word "sovereignty" from its first draft. The President was to obtain the sovereignty over the land necessary; now he is simply to obtain a "complete title" to it. But, for the United States to own land in a foreign country, without having even extra-territorial jurisdiction over it, is a dangerous novelty. Besides, the bill says not a word about neutralizing the canal, though we are under solemn treaty obligations to guarantee the neutrality of any canal that may be constructed across the isthmus. Instead of neutralizing, we are going to "defend" it, on the well-known principle of American public law that canals are built, not to promote commerce, but to provoke war and to be defended against a world in arms.

A caucus of Republican Representatives in Congress was held on Thursday evening. Its sole object was to consider the attitude which the party ought to assume towards the question of currency legislation. There was a full and frank discussion, which ended in the passage, by an almost unanimous vote, of a resolution providing for the appointment of a committee of eleven members of the present House who have been elected to the next House, "for the purpose of considering monetary legislation and submitting their views to a Republican caucus at the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress, with authority to confer with a like committee from the Senate." The discussion which led up to this action was interesting and, on the whole, encouraging. Three speakers opposed the idea of doing anything about the national finances. One of these three, Mr. Walker of Massachusetts, is a man who is always "on the off side." A professed friend of currency reform, he has by his "crankiness" done more to thwart progress than any silverite in the House, and it will be a great gain for the cause of sound legislation when he surrenders his seat to the gold-standard Democrat who beat him for reëlection last fall. The plea of those who opposed any action was that it would not be "good politics."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As Mr. Cannon of Illinois put it, "the present prosperity of the country makes it inexpedient to enter upon financial discussions." Mr. Walker was still more blunt. He said that "it would be far better politics to postpone action until after the campaign of 1900."

Gen. Gomez has made an astonishing discount in his demands for the Cuban army. To drop from $57,000,000 to $3,000,000 shows what a deep strategist the old General is; no wonder he made the Spanish think him invincible if he was able to exaggerate his strength as he is his claims. It was a tidy number of officers that the Cuban army had, according to the estimates for their pay submitted to President McKinley. Commissioned officers to the number of 5,119, and non-commissioned numbering 9,762, when the privates amounted to but 30,160, yield a proportion which could not be matched anywhere in the world, we suppose, off the comic-opera stage. Gen. Shafter's army, for example, had relatively only about one-third as many officers as the Cuban army, and yet it was not officers which Shafter lacked. But here, again, it may be that we have only another instance of the strategic ability of Gen. Gomez. He knew that the Spanish were all the while hoping to end the insurrection by killing off the Cuban generals, and he took measures to show them how desperate their cause was by creating so many that they could not possibly dispose of them all. But when all is said, the action of the Cubans in agreeing to accept a small advance of money and to disband is a great relief. It will immensely help on the work of pacifying the island.

Gen. Breckinridge is inviting the wrath of Alger, Corbin & Co., embalmers, and thereby subjecting himself to the peril of court-martial or inquiry, by revealing the fact that a lot of embalmed beef has been sent to Cuba by the War Department for the relief of destitute and starving natives there. He has been examining the rations sent to these poor people under the supervision of the Commissary Department, and has found "hundreds of cases of spoiled beef." He allows this fact to be made known, accompanied by a statement of belief that there is much more of the same sort of food among the supplies which have been forwarded. Some of the cases were given to the destitute on Saturday, and the ungrateful creatures absolutely refused them. Several of them were broken open in a public park, and an unanswerable demonstration was thus made as to their quality. Capt. Oskaloosa M. Smith, who represents Alger's Subsistence Department in and about Havana, is very indignant with Gen. Breckinridge, and has written a sharp letter to him asking him why he is there "interfering with the commissary business." This letter Gen. Breckinridge has ignored. Here is surely ample ground for a court-martial. The entire proceeding is insulting to Secretary Alger and to the Commissary Department. It is said that the "embalmed beef" went to Porto Rico before it was sent to Havana. That was done probably to get it into a thoroughly "ripe" condition. Should the destitute Cubans not be treated as well as our own soldiers?

Two more departments of the State Government at Albany have now discovered that they have deficits, making four thus far which have been left in that condition by the Black Administration. The list, with deficits, now stands: Public Buildings about $200,000; Public Works, $200,000; State Treasury, amount unknown; State Capitol Commissioner, $7,000. Others are likely to be added soon, for the cause which has produced the deficits in these four was common to all branches of the government. Mr. Easton, who was the Superintendent of Public Buildings under Govs. Morton and Black, says that among his 200 employees, he was allowed to have only one as his personal selection. All the others were put on the payrolls at the request of other people. The chief reason for the deficit in the Treasurer's department was the conduct of the retiring Black incumbent in raising all salaries of subordinates just as his term expired. He realized that this would be his last opportunity to get in a blow at the hated "starch," and he struck so violently at it that if his salary list were to stand throughout the present fiscal year, the department would have a deficit of nearly $30,000. Another very popular method of getting rid of "starch" was the employment of "special counsel" by the Attorney-General for various kinds of legal service. Good Platt men, who were often members of the Legislature also, were usually chosen as beneficiaries of this kind of expenditure.

The ecclesiastical trouble in England continues, and the people who thought Sir William Harcourt was making a mistake because of his manifest unfitness to handle such sacred subjects, find that they themselves were mistaken. In the first place, he has overthrown the ritualistic bishops in fair combat. They wanted to keep him on doctrinal and dogmatic ground, where he would appear to disadvantage when matched against divines, but he was too 'cute for them. He insisted on keeping them to the law of the land establishing the Church and prescribing its ritual, and in that field he won an easy victory. He unhorsed all the Church champions in rapid succession, and proved to the bishops that they had legal duties in the matter which they could not evade; that they had the legal power to repress ritualistic practices, and were bound to exercise it. They are accordingly, one by one, girding up their loins and setting about it. In the meantime, the attention of those who do not care to read long letters in the *Times*, is kept fixed on the matter by the excesses of Kensit, an unworthy and much exposed citizen, who does the work of disturbing the ritualistic services so as to associate them with tumult and disorder, which does damage them with the religiously and devoutly disposed. He charges "processions of the cross," shouts interruptions, alluding to "idolatrous practices," from galleries, and is accompanied by a considerable body of young athletes, who love a row and do not much care whether it is about the Eucharist or a race-horse. These people are able to keep going because of a good deal of sneaking popular sympathy, and they produce effect by creating scandal.

There were some striking points in the speech on the French colonial system which M. Pelletan, reporter on the Budget, delivered in the French Chamber the other day. He remarked that, while the army and navy cost more than those of any other country, the colonies cost more than those of all other countries put together. At this there were exclamations of incredulity, but M. Pelletan proceeded to quote figures to show that England spent 30 millions on her colonies, while Holland, Spain, Portugal, Germany, and Italy spent about 30 millions, making 60 altogether, whereas France spent 80 millions. What benefit, he demanded, did France reap from those 80 millions—or rather 90, for the estimates were always exceeded? In 1897, French exports to the colonies amounted to 118 millions, and, assuming the profit to be 20 per cent., the cost price was 95 millions. This gave a net loss of about 60 millions. England, on the other hand, exported 2,000 millions' worth of goods. He was aware that the West Africa colonies were remunerative, but why embark in adventures in which there was nothing to be gained? This system of conquests at a certain loss was an absurdity unprecedented in history. Never before had a nation expended about 60 millions and many lives for the singular advantage of ruling by force over distant populations. Could this absurdity, he asked, be continued at a time when the debt cost one milliard and the national defence another? The root of the evil was that there was no colonization, but only military occupation, while there were constant conflicts between the colonists and the military authorities. At this point M. Pelletan was interrupted, but he insisted that France was really governed by a bureaucracy, and that there was not a sufficient check on expenditure.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE END OF THE BEGINNING.

The outbreak at Manila, which has been long expected, occurred on Saturday, and the ratification of the peace treaty followed, almost inevitably, on Monday. Very few of our public men have the courage to stand up against a military excitement. Any one who wants to know how our statesmen at Washington felt on hearing of the "rebel" attack on our lines at Manila, will do well to read Sir George Trevelyan's fourth and fifth chapters of his recently published 'American Revolution,' describing the state of mind of George III. and his cabinet after they got the news of Lexington and Bunker Hill. A glance, too, at Burke on 'Conciliation with America' will suggest some useful reflections. He will not find much talk of justice, or mercy, or conciliation, or peaceful relations, or trade, or commerce, or kindliness, in the lucubrations of these statesmen, but much about "lawful authority" and "dignity" and "treason" and "wickedness" and "national prestige" and "rebellion" and "insolence." There is nothing better known in history than the armed conqueror's vocabulary.

There had been a vigorous censorship of telegrams, and the military dispatches had led us to believe that the Filipinos were quieting down and acquiescing in our rule. It appears that this was not true, and that our agents really knew nothing, or very little, about the feelings of the natives; that the American people were as ill informed about the Filipinos as the Filipinos about us. Had they known anything about us, they would not have indulged in an armed outbreak on or about the very day on which the vote was to be taken on the treaty in the Senate. By calm discussion, by appeals to the reason and sense of justice of the American people, they were making considerable headway; by taking arms, they have undoubtedly injured their cause, even if they have not helped ours. It reminds us of Cervera's coming out of Santiago to be destroyed just as Shafter was thinking of retreating.

But the treaty is now really of little consequence. The news from Manila confirms what we said the other day as to its having given us nothing except a right to conquer, if we could, in return for $20,000,000; or, in other words, what the lawyers call a *chose in action*. If Spain could have delivered the goods, they might have possibly been worth the money; but twenty millions of dollars for the right to try to do what Spain has been vainly trying to do for many years, makes it seem as if we had bought "a pig in a poke." Judging from the experience of the Spaniards, this war may last long. In every engagement we shall undoubtedly kill more Filipinos than they will kill of us, and cause more misery among these creatures than they can possibly cause among us, and keep the world wondering over the strangeness of the business in which America is engaged in the hundred and tenth year of its existence. What fills us with most apprehension, and we should think would do most to keep Mr. McKinley awake at night, is the fact recorded by Prof. Worcester in his book on the archipelago, that the tactics by which the natives were able to achieve so many successes against the Spaniards were to draw them into the interior in pursuit, and then disappear, leaving them in some unhealthy region to wrestle with malaria. Against disease, neither Mausers nor Gatlings nor Maxims will avail us.

But, however the thing now goes, there are certain reflections which no enlightened and civilized man can escape. We have apparently rushed into this business with as little preparation or forethought as into the Cuban war. We got hold of the notion that it would be a good thing to annex 1,200 islands at the other end of the world, simply because we won a naval victory over a feeble Power in the harbor of one of them, and because people like Griggs of New Jersey wanted some "glory." We then went to work to buy 1,200 islands without any knowledge of their extent, population, climate, productions, or of the feelings, wishes, or capacity of the inhabitants. We did not even know their number. While in this state of ignorance, far from trying to conciliate them, assure them of our good intentions, disarm their suspicions of us—men of a different race, religion, and language, of whom they had only recently heard—we issued one of the most contemptuous and insulting proclamations a conqueror has ever issued, announcing to them that their most hated and secular enemy had sold them to us, and that if they did not submit quietly to the sale we should kill them freely. This was bad enough, but what made it worse was that it was all, as a matter of fact, untrue. Is there in any history but Spanish history a record of statesmanship like this?

SOME WHOLESOME RESTRAINTS.

A good many people are troubled by the difficulty we have had in getting a treaty ratified by the Senate, and some are in favor of dispensing altogether with senatorial consent, Tanner fashion, when the Executive happens to be in a hurry and knows that the people are with him—which is simply another form of the French *coup d'état*. But when the present crisis is all over, whether we annex or do not annex, conquer or do not conquer, we believe there are few men who care for the future of America, who will not acknowledge that the delays and difficulties which the President has encountered, contain a lesson of the highest value. Nothing is more tempting, and, therefore, more full of danger for weak men, than a too subservient public. This is eminently true of taxation. Readiness to pay taxes, for instance, seems to be and is a political virtue, and yet it is not very far from being a vice, for it may, and probably will, prove a great encouragement to extravagance. There could not have been worse material for a political martyr than Wilkes was in England, or a more unworthy addition to the House of Commons, and yet the fight made on his behalf proved one of the most important contributions ever made to English constitutional liberty, and one of the most valuable lessons ever given to the Legislature.

When President McKinley came, drunk with glory and with flattery, out of the Spanish war, he evidently forgot that he was under any constitutional restraint, and undertook, as his proclamation of December 21 showed, to dispose of the Philippines in an address to the inhabitants that the first Napoleon, in the height of his power, might have issued. Nothing could have served so effectually to recall him to a sense of his real situation as the delay and difficulty he has had in getting the treaty through the Senate. Neither he nor any of his successors for many years to come, will forget that even the most successful war will not suffice to make the ratification of a treaty easy. The Senate will always contain bad men, cranky men, suspicious men, and jealous men, who, even if they cannot defeat a President's projects, will keep him mindful that he is a servant and not a master.

But the Senate is not the only useful restraint on him. His terror about possible rivals for the next term is another. A President who, like nearly every President in the past, seeks a second term, has, in the first place, to keep a strict watch on possible rivals, and see to it that they do not secure an undue share of credit or glory. "Possible rivals" is, in fact, the bogie which has haunted the imagination of both President McKinley and his Syndicate ever since the outbreak of the Spanish war. Every President sees in this the one serious political objection to going to war. The object of nearly every politician in seeking war in America since 1812 has been to secure glory for electioneering purposes. A Presidential candidate, therefore, who is already in the Presidential chair, has to keep a vigilant eye on such of his subordinates as are in any way connected with the war, lest they acquire an undue share of military credit. Over a year before the outbreak of the Spanish war, a well-informed correspondent wrote to us that the best guarantee against an attack on Spain was that the President could not himself take the field, and that the glory would almost certainly fall into the hands of some unknown military man, who might thereby succeed in wresting the next Presidential

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

term from even the "Advance Agent of Prosperity."

This fact had by no means escaped the attention of the McKinley Syndicate, and, in looking over the field to see who most needed watching, the first object of suspicion was naturally the Commander of the army. If he were to be allowed to go to the scene of action, the political consequences might prove disastrous, and he was therefore studiously kept at home and discredited as far as possible. But to keep rivals out of the field and yet make some money for the Syndicate was no easy matter, for no sooner had the Commander-in-Chief been cut off from military glory than he began to nose about the contracts, an offence hardly less serious than winning battles, and the more outrageous because the public had been so thoroughly intoxicated that it had become "patriotism" not to complain of anything the Syndicate did. Still, the substitution of a friendly board for a legal statutory court of inquiry revealed to the public the anxiety of the Syndicate about their plans. This anxiety was increased by the appearance on the scene of Roosevelt and his "Rough Riders," and their success in the field, and, worse than all, Roosevelt's success in New York. This made another candidate to be looked after and discredited. Roosevelt's civil-service performances and his mode of dealing with abuses have made him still more objectionable, but they have undoubtedly, by mere force of contrast, imposed very serious restraint on the Syndicate, who, if freed from it, would undoubtedly have "revelled in spoils" during the coming year, especially in administering our new possessions. We have little doubt that the beautiful colonial civil service which we were to have after Dewey's victory, has long been a joke in the War Department, over which the revered McKinley has smiled faintly.

To sum up, we believe that we may during the next year expect extremely valuable results from the necessity of keeping an eye on both Miles and Roosevelt. Peace, friends, hath her victories no less renowned than war. Neither Alger, nor Corbin, nor Eagan is the man to flinch when there is important work to be done, but we must not expect "'irresponsible assault" to displace them. The necessity of watching the two rivals will, however, we may be sure, prevent the execution of many brilliant schemes. Of one thing we may be certain: "The displeasure of the President at the course of the commanding general" will not find expression in a court-martial or court of inquiry. The more likely way of disposing of him will be that described in the *Sun* on Thursday:

"While nobody is in a position to say what the decision of the President will be, everything points to action relieving Gen. Miles of his duties without the formality of an official inquiry or a trial by a military body."

Public inquiries are nasty things, of which we have had enough. We advise the public to keep a close watch on the irritated Eagan, to see what happens to him.

JOHN MORLEY'S WARNINGS.

The speech which Mr. Morley made to his Scotch constituents three weeks ago was nominally on the political situation in England. It really dealt almost exclusively with the question of imperialism, which is cutting through English parties as it is through American. The political orators are few who can discuss a local condition in a way to illustrate universal truths, but John Morley is one of them. His penetrating analysis of British hyper-imperialism, his account of its drift, his warnings against the dangers into which it is recklessly running, are so clothed upon with the qualities of the higher statesmanship that they fit the imperialistic mania in any country. They are as profitable for reproof and correction to Americans as to Englishmen.

In addition to his other merits, Mr. Morley has the rare political virtue of not dreading to stand alone. He has written in one of his essays of "the awful loneliness of life"; but the loneliness of a public man cleaving to principle when all others forsake him and flee, does not frighten John Morley in the least. He likes as well as any man to be with a party espousing vital truth, but if it is a question between party and truth, he prefers to be lonely with the truth. The English Conservatives have been thoroughly Jingoed, and the larger number of Liberal leaders have run after the false gods of imperialism; but Mr. Morley refuses to allow himself to "slip and to drift a few yards to-day, a few more yards to-morrow, into the adoption of, or acquiescence in, a course of policy, a spirit and a temper" which he believes from the bottom of his heart to be "injurious to our material prosperity, to our national character, and to the strength and safety of our Imperial State." But he takes his position with such simple dignity, he has at his command such resources of philosophy and such an arsenal of language, that really, after reading his speech, one feels that it is not he that is lonely, but the other fellows. No man who had once been the object of Morley's finest sarcasm could get much true comfort out of having been proved to be silly along with great numbers.

The orator had a splendid and powerful passage in which he paid his respects to the Jingo clergy. His own reputed atheism lent just the needed edge to his rebuke of Christian apologists for war. He had for text a clerical address at a meeting of the Congregational Union, in which were all the usual mumbling clauses to the effect that we could not be for peace at any price, that there were worse things than war, that we lived in a work-a-day world not likely to adopt at once the higher laws of religious life. What a spectacle it was, cried Mr. Morley, to see good men in the excruciating dilemma of dreading to be Jingo, and yet dreading still more to be thought for peace at any price. The fighting bishops of the Middle Ages could not have seemed more out of place as holy men. Worse things than war! So there are worse things than smallpox and delirium tremens; but you do not expect your physician to console you with the reflection. It was true that we lived in a practical world; but was it not for men who believed in the higher laws to insist upon carrying them precisely into that practical world? Otherwise, you had only to imagine these clergymen in company with the Forty Thieves, and you would hear them saying, "We are for the Ten Commandments, but still this is a work-a-day world; we cannot stand aloof from the practical business of life, and we are not for the Ten Commandments at any price." This was what was rapidly becoming of the Decalogue, and as for the Golden Rule the modern clerical version of that was, "Always swim with the stream."

Mr. Morley rose almost to prophetic stature when he denounced the common and complacent remark that "Gordon is avenged" by the slaughter of 10,000 men at Omdurman. It was an "impious and dishonoring" notion that that heroic man, as merciful as he was fearless, was like "some implacable pagan deity who needed to be appeased by hecatombs of human sacrifice." Equally trenchant and searching was Mr. Morley on the question of conquest in order to make trade; butchery of natives in order to make places for aspiring Scotch youth. He asked his Scottish audience if they had made up their minds once for all that "it is right to kill people because it is good for trade." If they had not considered that nice question for a nation with a conscience, they should do so at once, for the doctrine was spreading. Morley's account of the five points of the Jingo creed we must cite entire. It was as follows:

"First, that territory was territory, and all territory was worth acquiring; second, that all territory, especially if anybody happened to want it, was worth paying any price for; third, that this country possessed the purse of Fortunatus, bulging and overflowing with gold, and was free to fling millions here and there with the certainty that benignant fairies would, by magic, make them good, and so let us spend easy with lavish hand and a free conscience. The fourth article of the creed was—Do not show the slightest regard to the opinions of other nations, and you have no share whatever in the great collective responsibility of civilized people as joint guardians of the interests of peace and good order to the state system of Europe. The fifth article of the Jingo creed was that the interests of the people of this country—and he here drew no distinction between classes and masses—advancement in all the arts of civilized life

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and well-being, their needs and their requirements, were completely and utterly a secondary and subordinate question."

The warning which Mr. Morley gave that imperialism would break down disastrously on the financial side, was peculiarly one for Americans to take to heart. We are having our fat years now, but does not all experience show that they will be followed by lean years? The burdens which are barely tolerable now will become then too grievous to be borne. The army and navy and the whole blown foreign service will then be in danger of being starved. Social discontent will rear a more threatening head than ever. New blows will be levelled at property and public security. Exploitation of the waste places of the earth for the benefit of capitalists will surely lead to spoliation of capitalists in their own land. This is in special degree the danger of a free nation smitten with the thirst for territorial aggrandizement and the pagan pride of empire. It will overstrain its resources, and will turn and rend at home the leaders who have lured it into perils and disasters abroad. The only remedy, for Englishmen or Americans, is to insist upon discussion and deliberation, and not to forsake for one single hour "those principles and professions, that temper and that faith, which came down to them from the great men who begat them."

THE THEATRE AND PUBLIC MORALS

The report that a bill will be introduced before long in the State Senate, the object of which is to establish the office of Theatrical Censor in New York city, suggests some serious reflections. There can be no doubt that something of the kind is wanted in this city badly enough, but it would be a good deal better to let conditions remain as they are than to intrust the powers of such an office to an unworthy or incapable person. It is not difficult to imagine the sort of man who would be selected for Theatrical Censor by our present rulers. The post would afford opportunities for some of the very richest pickings that ever came within the grasp of a hungry politician. He would be able to exact tribute not only from the better kind of theatrical managers, but from the proprietors of every music hall and variety show in the metropolis. The very last thing in the world that he would think about would be the effect of a performance upon public morals. His only object would be to make the giving of any entertainment, without the payment of tribute, as difficult as possible.

Everybody knows that an active stage censorship exists in all the greater European cities, and everybody knows also that our very foulest dramatic importations come to us from the countries where the censorship is supposed to be the strictest. The explanation of this fact is that the Continental censors concern themselves chiefly with political sentiment, and care very little indeed about any mere offence to decency or morality. Here, of course, there is no demand for a political censorship. We should need an officer somewhat akin to the examiner of plays in London, a university scholar of eminence who has devoted many years to the study of theatrical literature, and is able to comprehend the scope and province of the theatre. He confines his supervision almost entirely to matters affecting questions of propriety, and, being entirely above all suspicion of political influence or pecuniary interest, it is very seldom that one of his decisions is opposed or disputed. In fact, so little is heard of him that comparatively few persons are aware of his existence or of the authority which he exercises. The appointment of such a man in this city, with ample discretionary powers and an absolute guarantee of non-interference, might be beneficial, but in the present circumstances it would be folly to look for any such Utopian occurrence.

Nevertheless, it is high time that some steps were taken to check the increasing recklessness and audacity with which the lower order of our theatrical entertainers are seeking to fill their pockets by pandering to the baser instincts of the vulgar crowd. No old theatre-goer can fail to be impressed with the extraordinary development of license upon the New York stage, which is practically the stage of the whole country, within the last twenty-five years. In the palmy days of the old Union Square Theatre, for instance, in the seventies, there was a constant outcry in conservative quarters against what was called the demoralizing influence of the English adaptations of the contemporary French emotional drama, which were so popular at that time. The influence of some of them, to be sure, was not particularly wholesome, but all of them were submitted to a pretty careful process of expurgation, and the evil in them, as a rule, was only darkly suggested and never openly expressed. It is not so very long ago that the utterance of a very common, almost meaningless, oath upon the boards of the Madison Square Theatre was resented as an outrage upon the feelings of a refined and delicate audience. No scruples of this kind are discernible in the conduct of the spectators in our modern theatres. Whereas, in the olden days, a mere allusion was resented, the actual representation of the thing itself is now watched with approval and even eagerness, and in many cases the more real the abomination, the more vigorous is the applause.

There can be no doubt that the wide dissemination of the verbal and pictorial horrors of the yellow press is responsible to a very large extent, if not entirely, for the general demoralization into which the taste of the middle class—that is, of the theatre-supporting class—appears to have fallen. When an appetite for the morbid, the unclean, and the prurient has been encouraged by surreptitious reading, it requires grosser and grosser means of gratification. It was in the music halls that the public demand for what is commonly called spicy entertainment was first discovered, and the want was supplied with diabolical celerity. The most audacious performers, male and female, degenerates who had become notorious in Paris and Vienna, some of whom had been expelled by the police of those profligate cities on account of their abominable exhibitions, not only found a refuge but a rich reward in our music halls. They made fortunes for themselves and for the men who hired them. It was the spectacle of this prosperity, so easily if so vilely won, that prompted the managers of certain second and third-rate theatres to enter into active competition with them in the direction of public indecency. It would have been bad enough if the evil had stopped there, but of late the directors of houses hitherto deemed respectable have not scorned to profit by presenting scenes upon their boards which, upon the street, would call for the instant interference of the police. And the amazing part of it all is that the audiences which witness these atrocities unmoved, are composed largely of men and women of all ages, possessing every outward indication of education and refinement.

There is no saying to what depths this degradation of the stage and of the public may not proceed if some means be not found to punish the most notorious offenders. There is a notion on the part of the public that it is the duty of the better newspapers to act as moral constables in this matter, but the fact is, that the newspapers, although they can encourage the mischief in a thousand ways, are quite powerless, as the case now stands, to suppress or even greatly to mitigate it. Experience has proved beyond all possibility of doubt that an honest denunciation of a play on account of its uncleanness has no other result than the sending of a great number of readers to witness it. It is unfortunately the fact that some newspapers outside the admittedly yellow class, while feigning virtuous indignation, contribute enormously to the profits of this unclean business, by publishing minute details of the grosser offences perpetrated before the footlights. It is difficult to believe that a remedy for an evil so glaring cannot be found within the provisions of the common law. An indictment of two or three managers at the instigation of the District Attorney, and a prompt and remorseless relegation of them to the penitentiary, if only for a week or two, on the score of disorderly or indecent conduct, would be more effective than any censorship which is at all likely to be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

established under the patronage of Tammany Hall. If the District Attorney has not time to bestow upon the consideration of a question affecting so vitally the moral well-being of the community, the matter might be taken in hand by some of the societies for the prevention of vice, which could not easily find a more important subject on which to exercise their energies.

REMBRANDT IN LONDON.

LONDON, January 7, 1899.

When in doubt, attack the Royal Academy, seems to be the motto of a certain section of the British public. At irregular intervals, usually at moments of least provocation, the story of Academical evils is told again, and again new methods of reform are urged upon long-suffering artists. This winter, the attack has come in the shape of a large and elaborate treatise ('The Royal Academy: Its Uses and Abuses'), by Mr. Laidlay, B.A., Barrister and Artist. I do not propose to enter into Mr. Laidlay's argument, in the first place because my concern just now is not with the crimes of the Academy, and, in the second, because Mr. Laidlay's methods are far too confused and involved. It seems a pity, so long as he took upon himself the task, that he did not set about accomplishing it more thoroughly. The history of the Royal Academy, written calmly and dispassionately, would be a far more eloquent plea against this much-abused institution than a windy arraignment prompted, apparently, by some personal grievance. From the time of Gainsborough, and thence onward through the period when Fuseli proclaimed his wrongs, there has been reason enough to find fault; but it is not likely that Mr. Laidlay can be successful where commissions, and societies, and movements, and New English Art Clubs, and newspaper crusades have failed, especially as artists have the remedy in their own hands if they really felt they could endure the injustice no longer. If outsiders ceased to send to the Academy exhibitions, if they combined to boycott it, the Academy could not survive many years. The only immediate outcome of Mr. Laidlay's book, however, has been the suggestion that a new, a liberal, a just, a truly representative Academy be started by the County Council, which, having already taken art under its wing by establishing a technical school as a rival to South Kensington, is considered by its admirers to be ready equipped to solve any and all artistic problems in the country. But I must confess, the performances of the County Council as patron of art, so far, do not inspire very great confidence; and as the scheme would adopt all that is practically worst in the old Salon, and as, in the face of the six thousand or more artists in the country, it gayly calls for a gallery in which every picture shall hang on the line, the last probably has already been heard of it.

All this is very amusing—though perhaps a little tragic—in its way; but more amusing still is the wonderful luck that has attended the Academy at this crisis, as at every other stage of its triumphant career. Had Mr. Laidlay published his book in the spring, had his summing up of old evils been at once followed by a fresh evil in the spring exhibition, with its accompanying rumors and complaints of favoritism and worse, he might at least have run the chance of sympathetic notice and discussion. But it so happens that hardly has his book attracted the attention of the critics when the Royal Academy opens one of the most important winter exhibitions it has ever held. A couple of years ago the Council decided that there was no money in Old Masters, and last year and the year before Millais and Leighton were offered as a substitute. But the supply of modern Academical masters is limited, and it seems to have occurred to the Council that the Academy's "Winter-Garment of Repentance," as the winter show has been defined, had its moral value, even if it did not pay in actual shillings. And Mr. Laidlay is silenced, and municipal schemes discounted, and the Academy justifies its existence by an Exhibition of Rembrandts which, if it but included "The Night Watch" and "The Syndics," would be finer in many respects than the much more loudly advertised show in Amsterdam. As a stroke of policy, nothing could be more masterly: chance, certainly, is always on the side of the Royal Academy.

I pointed out at the time that many of the most notable pictures at Amsterdam came from England—the superb portraits sent by Lord Iveagh; the little Velasquez-like boy belonging to Lord Spencer; Lord Northbrook's landscape with its careful study of light; the Duke of Westminster's beautiful "Gentleman with a Hawk" and "Lady with a Fan"; the Queen's pictures from Buckingham Palace. All these reappear at Burlington House, together with many others from English collections, that were not seen in Holland. Indeed, the most remarkable feature of the show is the proof it gives of the great numbers of fine Rembrandts that are owned in England. The National Gallery is not drawn upon for contributions; only a very few foreign collections and museums have loaned their treasures. And yet, while there were one hundred and twenty-three pictures at Amsterdam, there are one hundred and two here, and these include far less rubbish.

Rubbish seems a hard word to use in speaking of Rembrandt, but at Amsterdam you could not help feeling that if Rembrandt did paint some of the work shown it would be doing him greater honor to forget it. Where England is poorest is in the large subject pictures. But, after all, there are but two which fully sustain and deserve the fame they have won for him. No one but Rembrandt could have painted "The Syndics," though when you look at some of his minor groups, for instance at "The Shipbuilder and his Wife" from Buckingham Palace, which is here, and which I had remembered as one of his masterpieces, you wonder how they would stand the test of hanging in the Haarlem Museum with the great Regent Pictures by Franz Hals. The "Shipbuilder and his Wife" is one of his early works, it is true, and it may be said that the comparison is not altogether just. But I mention it only because to see it again at the Academy is to realize more than ever that, great as an artist may be, it does not follow, as the enthusiast is apt to think, that everything he chooses to do must be beyond reproach. The other exception, of course, is "The Night Watch," which holds a place apart. Beyond these two, I think every one who has seen Rembrandt's large subject pictures, and who is honest, will admit that no small measure of disappointment mingles with the admiration they inspire. There is one at Burlington House, "Belshazzar's Feast," lent by the Earl of Derby, which is so weak in color, so poor in drawing, so commonplace and even grotesque in composition, that you cannot understand how the man who was painting that same "Shipbuilder and his Wife" in 1633 could have committed this indiscretion "about 1636," the date suggested in the catalogue. There are, however, two or three of his smaller Biblical and classical subjects that are as lovely, as marvellous in their manner, as the larger canvases are disappointing; above all, a little "Tobit and his Wife," belonging to Sir Francis Cook, and not exhibited at Amsterdam—a rich, shadowy interior, with a glimpse of a red town and a bit of green through the window that helps to remind you what an incomparable De Hooghe Rembrandt would have proved, had he not been Rembrandt. There are one or two landscapes also that did not find their way to the Dutch show, especially the Marquess of Lansdowne's "Mill," with its rich golden glow, exhibited, if I am not mistaken, at the Winter Exhibition a few years ago.

But when all is said, it is in his portraits that Rembrandt was supreme, and one or two now at Burlington House I do not remember ever to have seen. The most remarkable is Lord Penrhyn's "Lady with a Parrot," painted in 1657, just a few years before that stately portrait of himself now in the possession of Lord Iveagh; at a time, that is, when his eyes were keenest to discern the beauty and picturesqueness and romance of old age. The old lady, in her simple black gown and severe cap and collar, sitting so quietly with her arms resting on the arms of the chair, in her hand a handkerchief, as in the hands of that no less perfect "Old Lady" of the Luxembourg, has all the serenity and dignity of Rembrandt's finest presentments of himself, when age had grizzled his hair and wrinkled his powerful face. Another portrait of peculiar interest comes from Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan and is called "Portrait of the Painter." I do not know on what authority this title is given, and I fancy many will be disposed to question it; for the picture represents a handsome youth of apparently not more than fifteen or sixteen. He sits with a drawing on his knees, from which he looks up and directly at you, his face eager and serious and full of charm. But there are certain passages in it, more particularly in the treatment of parts of the costume, that point to a later date; the technique is that of a much more mature period than the one suggested. The only explanation is that the canvas may have been begun when Rembrandt was still the youth it depicts, and not then finished, but kept by him in his studio and touched and repainted from time to time when he chanced to remember it; and this seems likely enough. A few other portraits have the added interest of not being so well known as the greater number shown. There are several wonderful old women; there is another much younger woman, lent by Lord Leconfield, commonplace for Rembrandt—an early work of 1635—but curious for the Vandyck-like grace of the poses and prettiness of the face; and there is, too, a portrait of "Alotte Adriaans," of four years later, that almost suggests Holbein.

Amsterdam, supplementing the great national collections, one supposed, could have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nothing more to learn about Rembrandt. But already, a few months later, in England one has the chance to see other phases of his work, other proofs of his tremendous energy and genius. He was simply inexhaustible as an artist. I make no effort, however, to enter into further detail about the collection, because, as I have explained, the most important pictures in it are those I described when I wrote of the Amsterdam Exhibitions; and as in general character the two shows vary but slightly, the effect produced, the conclusions forced upon one, are much the same in both cases. Even the drawings, as at Amsterdam, come chiefly from the portfolios of Mr. Heseltine and M. Bonnat. And, it is to be regretted, the Academy has adhered so closely to the example set at Amsterdam that Rembrandt's etchings have not been hung. However, Mr. Colvin has long been preparing an exhibition of all the Rembrandt prints and drawings in the British Museum collection, one of the finest and most complete in the world. After this, there will remain nothing to do but to prepare the perfect show of all, in which only Rembrandt's masterpieces, brought together from every corner of Europe and America, would be placed side by side in one gallery.

The Academy has issued an excellent catalogue, with a useful chronological index added. It will prove of value to all students of Rembrandt as a book of reference, even to those who have not had the pleasure of seeing the show. N. N.

PARNELL.—I.*

DUBLIN, January 21, 1899.

Presuming the time had come when it were well for the memory of Mr. Parnell and for the good of Ireland that his life should be written, few were better qualified for the task than Mr. Barry O'Brien. It has been objected that he was not allowed access to Mr. Parnell's private papers, and that no one, during the survival of many still in the prime of life, is likely to be allowed access to them. But Parnell's was a life whose vivid interest depends not on unpublished details, but rather on a strong personality and the manner in which it impressed and affected contemporaries. Mr. O'Brien's book might be more complete if private papers had been open to him; but, even without that advantage, it may be more valuable than any biography written after the present generation had passed away could be. The book compels attention; otherwise there are not many Irishmen that understood and felt with Parnell through the major portion of his career, who would not, from the sadness of the last months of it, shrink from the task of reviewal.

Considering the political bias of the author, it is an admirable piece of work. Few men were in the position, as he shows himself to have been, to elicit, concerning phases in the life of Mr. Parnell, opinions, verging on the confidential, of Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright, Mr. Duffy, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Rhodes, and other prominent men. He has availed himself of his opportunities, and insured for his book a permanent place in all libraries pretending to any completeness in the department of British and Irish history. The balance of the relation is well preserved. Too many writers of political lives lose themselves in history. Here we have no more than immediately concerns the subject of the story; and we are given, what is often wanting, the environment of the stage when the hero appears upon it. I shall have occasion to differ from Mr. O'Brien in his presentation of the facts of the last year of Mr. Parnell's life.

Parnell came of a family honorably associated with literature and with the history of Ireland, and upon his mother's side with the history of the United States. There was doubtless a peculiar strain in the blood, as appeared in the curious superstitions that, through all, lurked in the corners of Mr. Parnell's mind. He was born in an ancestral home, amidst lovely scenery consecrated in Irish song. There was nothing attractive in his childhood and early life, no promise of the character that was to develop. He was "sent down" at Cambridge for misconduct, and never completed a college course. A youth who opined that the Greek lexicon was wrong when it did not justify his rendering of a passage, was not a promising subject for university distinction. Even in his prime, he showed himself ignorant and uninterested concerning literature and art. His tastes lay towards mechanics and chemistry. His entrance into politics in his twenty-ninth year appeared more a freak than anything else. In so far as it was earnest, it was due to resentment at the low estimation in which his country was held. "The idea that the Irish were despised was always in Charles's mind," wrote a sister. His début was eminently discouraging to those who had made themselves responsible for bringing him forward. Says O'Connor Power:

"He seemed to me a nice, gentlemanly fellow, but he was hopelessly ignorant, and seemed to me to have no political capacity whatever. He could not speak at all. He was hardly able to get up and say, 'Gentlemen, I am a candidate for the representation of the County of Dublin.' We all listened to him with pain while he was on his legs, and felt immensely relieved when he sat down" (i., 75).

The home-rule movement, inaugurated five years previously, was flickering towards extinction. Fenianism, intensified by resentment at the cruel treatment of the treason-felony prisoners, was the dominant power in Irish politics. In Parliament it was impossible effectively to arouse the British conscience concerning Ireland. Mr. Biggar and Mr. Ronayne had the clear-sightedness to see the necessity for a change of tactics. "What's the good?" B. would say: "we can't get them [Irish bills] through. The English stop our bills. Why don't we stop their bills? That's the thing to do. No Irish bills; but stop English bills. No legislation; that's the policy, sir; that's the policy. Butt's a fool; too gentlemanly; we're all too gentlemanly" (i., 92). Parnell followed Biggar's lead, and soon became the acknowledged head of an active Irish party, bent upon obtaining as much as possible for their country, and, when ignored, making themselves disagreeable. Some of the distinctive customs and procedure of Parliament upon which Englishmen most prided themselves had to be radically altered before they could recover control of its proceedings. The deaths of Butt, Martin, and others of the elder generation of Irish Nationalists left the ground clear for the exercise of Mr. Parnell's peculiar genius. Those not content to serve under him had to stand aside.

"Parnell excelled us all," said one of his obstructive colleagues, "in obstructing as if he were really acting in the interests of the British legislators. He was cool, calm, businesslike, always kept to the point, and rarely became aggressive in voice or manner. . . . The very quietness of his demeanor, the orderliness with which he carried out a policy of disorder, served only to exasperate, and even to enrage, his antagonists" (i., 107).

Mr. O'Brien then quotes from another follower:

"He was a beautiful fighter. He knew exactly how much the House would stand. One night I was obstructing. S—— was near me. He was generally timid, afraid of shocking the House. He said: 'O——, you had better stop, or you will be suspended.' 'Oh, no,' quietly interjected Parnell, who was sitting by us, 'they will stand a good deal more than this; you may go on for another half hour.' I did go on for another half hour or so. Then there was an awful row, and I stopped. Parnell had gauged the exact limit. Another night I was obstructing again. Parnell came in suddenly and said, 'Stop now, or there will be an explosion in five minutes, and I don't want a row to-night.' In all these things Parnell was perfect" (i., 109).

It was not without opposition and doubt as to the sincerity of his professions that the Fenians left him alone to follow a constitutional movement. He suffered personal violence, and was driven from at least one platform. He managed with consummate adroitness to conciliate their opposition, and ultimately to attach them, without actually committing himself to them. His attitude towards those who differed from him, whether they were in advance or lagged behind, was not opposition, but an appeal that a fair chance should be given him to work out his programme. "We shall therefore see him," writes Mr. O'Brien, "as the years roll by, standing on the verge of treason felony, but with marvellous dexterity always preventing himself from slipping over." "Parnell's great gift was his faculty of reducing a quarrel to the smallest dimensions," and he had an instinct for knowing, where he appeared least informed, in political affairs.

And so he became the best hated man in England, the idol of the Irish people—he was the first Irishman since the days of the Volunteers who, upon their own ground, humiliated those who despised Ireland. A new departure came in bad harvests and an outburst of agrarian discontent that had only slumbered. He was led by Davitt into the establishment of the Land League, through which society in Ireland was shaken to its foundations. These were the days when Mr. Parnell uttered the few sayings that survive in the minds of the people: "Hold a firm grip on your homesteads." "Ireland cannot afford to lose a single man." "No man has the right to fix the boundary of the march of a nation." And those fateful words, so often used as a handle against him and his party in the after home-rule struggle: "None of us . . . will be satisfied until we have destroyed the last link which keeps Ireland bound to England." (Were they an echo of words used by Grattan one hundred years previously, and quoted by Boswell to Johnson? "We will persevere till there is not one link of the English chain left to clank upon the rags of the meanest beggar in Ireland.")

The Government's hand was forced, and a land bill surpassing the wildest hopes of previous land reformers (but since curtailed in its benefits by administration) was placed upon the statute book. Once again Ireland realized that material reform was to be obtained only through violence and outrage. "I must

*"The Life of Charles Stewart Parnell, 1846-1891." By R. Barry O'Brien, Barrister-at-Law. Harpers. Two volumes in one. Pp. 378, 394.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make one admission," said Mr. Gladstone in 1893, "and that is, that, without the Land League, the act of 1881 would not now be on the statute book" (i., 293). Some thousand prominent Leaguers were already in prison, under Mr. Forster's act, "on reasonable suspicion." Mr. Parnell conceived and advised that the land act would be made best use of by bringing forward strong test cases at first, not by the tenants crowding into the courts. Having given grounds for the suspicion that he desired to thwart the act and discredit the Government, he was himself committed to Kilmainham. The abortive "no-rent" manifesto followed. Outrages and murder increased to an appalling extent, discrediting Mr. Forster's assurances that, if he were given a free hand in imprisoning suspected persons, the country would subside. Even Mr. Parnell was startled.

The negotiations ending in the "Kilmainham treaty" are succinctly and clearly stated by Mr. O'Brien. Mr. Parnell, with his Parliamentary colleagues, and Mr. Davitt, who had been relegated to Portland prison, were released on the understanding that Mr. Parnell at least would use his influence to lull the agitation. Wide reforms were foreshadowed by the Liberals, and a new page might have opened in Irish history but for the murder of the Secretaries. A coercive régime was again entered upon, and thoughts of reconcilement were abandoned. This was the period when Ireland, in defiance of the Pope's dissuasive rescript, contributed £40,000 to clear Mr. Parnell's estate from mortgage and make him easy as to money affairs. Home rule became the one plank in his platform. So early as 1880 he had declared: "I would not have taken off my coat and gone to this work if I had not known that we were laying the foundation in this movement for the regeneration of our legislative independence" (i., 240). British parties were played off against each other, and at one time, as is shown through the Carnarvon negotiations, fully elucidated by Mr. O'Brien, there appeared every prospect of the Conservatives adopting some modified form of home rule. Mr. Chamberlain, in the extended interview concerning those times which he accorded Mr. O'Brien, appears to clear himself from the charge of inconsistency in relation to that question. He never contemplated more than a system of representative councils in supersession of the boards by which Irish affairs are administered.

At the general election of 1885, Mr. Parnell returned to Parliament backed by a solid phalanx of 84 of the 103 Irish representatives. The Liberals were 335, the Conservatives 249. By throwing himself and his 84 men on the side of the Conservatives he could neutralize the Liberal majority, while, joined to the Liberals, a working majority of over 170 could be shown. Mr. Gladstone brought in his Home Rule Bill. It was defeated, and the Conservatives returned to power. Then followed the most interesting years of Irish agitation. The agricultural question again came up. The Plan of Campaign was launched. A perpetual Coercion Act was passed. Irish members, Irish suspects, Irish agitators (not implicated in treason) were treated with previously unheard-of severity in imprisonment. Parnell himself unaccountably held aloof from the fray, and seldom visited Ireland except on rare occasions, such as that so charmingly and graphically described by Mr. Horgan early in the second volume. The Gladstonian Liberals became enthusiastic for the Irish cause in all its phases. No Liberal platform in Great Britain was complete without the presence of Irish members. Ireland was flooded with British sympathizers. The "union of hearts" between the two peoples appeared complete—the contest of centuries at an end. Happy were those Irish patriots who then sank to rest. The forgery of the Pigott letters was laid bare mainly through the acumen of Mr. Egan.* The speeches of Sir Charles Russell and Mr. Davitt before the Commission presented the Irish cause in a clear and favorable light to the British people. Upon the other hand, the Irish Unionists, realizing as never before the danger of the situation as concerned themselves, banded themselves together for the fray in the "Loyal and Patriotic Union." At by-elections the home-rule cause steadily gathered strength, and a large Liberal majority at the next general election was certain. Most Home-Rulers confidently expected that within three years a Parliament would be sitting in Dublin. Mr. O'Brien thus opens chapter xxii. of his book:

"Parnell's career, from his entrance into public life, in 1875, until the beginning of 1890, had been almost an unbroken record of success. He had silenced factions, quelled dissensions, put down rivalries, reconciled opposing forces, combined constitutionalists, healed the ancient feud between the Church and the Fenians, . . . had united the Irish race all the world over, and placed himself at the head, not merely of a party, but of a nation. He had defeated almost all his enemies in detail. . . . He had, indeed, reached the highest pinnacle of his fame; he seemed invincible. Yet he was standing on a mine, and while the air still rang with the rejoicing which hailed his latest triumph, the train was fired, his doom was sealed."

He alone knew the mine upon which he stood. In him alone it lay to anticipate an explosion, and, as far as possible, mitigate its consequences. D. B.

*Mr. Parnell almost despaired of discovering the perpetrator, and proving the forgery, when Mr. Egan, who had retired to the United States, pointed out that the word "hesitancy," spelled "hesitency" in one of the letters published by the *Times*, was similarly spelled in letters from Pigott in his possession. The chapter dealing with these forgeries and the subsequent trial is one of the most interesting in the book.

Correspondence.

A KING OF THE PHILIPPINES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The speeches of Senators Platt (of Connecticut) and Foraker unwittingly reveal the abyss into which they ask the country to plunge with them. They no doubt reflect the sentiments of all who wish to launch on an unknown sea of adventure. When objection is made to incorporating Asiatics into our body politic because our national Constitution was made for European races, and particularly the Anglo-Saxon, and is not fit for the government of peoples who have no traditions of freedom and are steeped in despotism, their answer is that Congress has absolute plenary power over Territories, and is subject to no Constitutional restrictions in governing them—in other words, that a government of a Territory is entirely *outside* the Constitution. The only practicable way by which Congress can exercise such power is by transferring it to the President. It is true, they say, that, in an organic act, Congress usually extends the Constitution and laws of the United States over a Territory, but that the Constitution does not *proprio vigore* extend itself there, as it does over a State. Consequently, if, after adopting the constitution for a Territory, Congress should pass an act in conflict with it, to that extent it repeals the constitution.

These declarations should be taken as notice that if the Philippines are annexed, they will be governed without regard to Constitutional limitations. The advocates of this policy do not seem to be conscious, in making this avowal, that they furnish an overwhelming argument against holding Asiatic possessions, where, from necessity, Congress must invest the President with a trinity of power—executive, legislative, and judicial—which is the very essence of despotism. It means the creation of a great Oriental monarchy and an attempt to establish at Washington the empire of the Caliphs of Bagdad. It is not much comfort to be told that our President will be another Haroun al-Raschid. Mr. Platt quotes from a speech of Mr. Webster's the following language as to the power of Congress over the Territories: "It may establish any such government and any such laws in the Territories as in its discretion it may see fit. It is subject, of course, to the rules of justice and propriety, but it is under no Constitutional restraints." He also cites with approval, as does Mr. Foraker, the acts of Congress that made the President absolute dictator in the Territories of Florida and Louisiana, and a late decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (86 Fed. Reporter, 456), the syllabus of which reads: "Congress has full legislative power over the Territories, unrestricted by the limitations of the Constitution." The Court was unanimous, and the opinion is supported by references to Supreme Court decisions tending in the same direction. Be it so; then let us beware of intrusting Congress with this colossal power to be delegated to the President, except in a case of absolute necessity. If there were a rocky island in the Pacific beyond our jurisdiction that was a Gibraltar which commanded the entrance to the Golden Gate, no one would question the propriety of our acquiring and holding it in self-defence. No such reason can be alleged for our holding the Philippines, but just the reverse. They would be a weak point in war which we should have to defend. The force detached to defend them could be of no use anywhere else.

The occasions for using despotic power should be reduced to a minimum; familiarity with it abroad may gradually sap and undermine all the safeguards of freedom at home. In such a school the Prætorian bands were trained. A government of the Philippines must be a despotism or no government at all. Asiatics are not fit for anything else. Mr. Foraker says we will hold them only temporarily until these people are fit for self-government. But all people are fit for self-government in their own way. Asiatics and Africans are as contented with their forms of government as we are; they never will be with ours. But why confine our philanthropy to the Philippines? Why not embrace all Asia in this benevolent scheme to regenerate mankind? The Veiled Prophet of Khorassan undertook that. But we can't govern Asiatics consistently with those principles of liberty that are embodied as a bill of rights in the first ten amendments to the Constitution. Congress can establish a religion, extend the Anti-Polygamy Act to the archipelago, or grant an indulgence

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to Mussulmans and let them follow the example of Mahomet; it can enact bills of attainder and ex-post-facto laws, and deprive men of life, liberty, and property without due process of law. The islands will be governed as a Crown colony, and the President will be King of the Philippines. How long, then, will it be before that immortal ode—"Alexander's Feast"—will cease to be simply an imaginary picture of a scene in a long-buried past? But those who rely on the authority of Mr. Webster have failed to heed his prophecy of woe in a speech against expansion and imperialism delivered shortly before the one quoted. He said:

"Arbitrary governments may have territories and distant possessions, because arbitrary governments may rule them by different laws and different systems. Russia may rule in the Ukraine and the provinces of the Caucasus and Kamtchatka by different codes, ordinances, or ukases. We can do no such thing. They must be of us, *part* of us, or else strangers."

The italics are Webster's. The fact that the advocates of annexation claim this gigantic, extra-constitutional power proves that it is their purpose to exercise it.

JNO. S. MOSBY.

SAN FRANCISCO, January 29, 1899.

THE DILEMMA OF THE FILIPINOS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Apropos of the missionary argument for expansion, the clergyman under whose ministry I sat last Sunday offered the following petition on behalf of the Filipinos:

"We pray Thee that those who prefer to remain in darkness, and are even willing to fight in order to do so, may, whether willingly or unwillingly, be brought into the light!"

Instantly there came to my mind the naïve remark of the pious author of the 'Chanson de Roland,' in describing one of the victories of Charlemagne over the Mussulmans:

"En la citet nen at remes païen
Ne seit ocis, o devient crestiiens;"

—that is to say: "There was not a pagan left in the city who was not either killed or made a Christian." So may it be in Manila, when a similar dilemma is prepared for its inhabitants!

The serious aspect of this matter is that, just as there were united in Charlemagne a greed for aggrandizement and a piously barbarous desire to make Christians by conquest, so we see joined together to-day—not in the same individuals, but in the unnatural coöperation of the most diverse dispositions—the imperialism of selfishness and the imperialism of philanthropy. Each forgets that its greatest successes in the past have been due to an appearance of disinterestedness. But no wonder that we move so fast with two such allies hand in hand!

Yours very truly,

RAYMOND MACDONALD ALDEN.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
January 30, 1899.

FRANKLIN'S "ANECDOTE."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Just before the proceedings of the first American Congress of 1774 reached Great Britain, the King suddenly dissolved Parliament, and issued writs for a general election. It was a move of peculiarly shrewd "politics," for the Ministry had every reason to believe that the proceedings of Congress would be conciliatory, tending to allay the heat of the English public against the colonies; and by thus prematurely forcing a new election while the public was still excited against America, it was hoped that the Government majority would be increased—a theory which proved eminently successful in practice. When the proceedings of the Congress were transmitted to Parliament, they came before men prepared to give them no heed, and were referred, with a great mass of other papers, to a committee which Edmund Burke happily styled "the Committee of Oblivion." Franklin, who was then in London, drew up what he termed an "anecdote" of the King's speech for the meeting of this Parliament, undoubtedly intended for publication in the press of the day, but which, so far as I have been able to learn, was not printed then, and is included in no collection of his writings, yet which deserves to be known, both for its clever imitation and for its shrewd prophecy.

Very truly yours,

PAUL LEICESTER FORD.

BROOKLYN, February 3, 1899.

ANECDOTE

The intended speech for the opening of the first Session of the present Parliament viz Novr 29 1774

My Lords and Gentlemen

It gives me much concern that I am obliged at the opening of this Parliament to inform you that none of the measures wch I adopted upon the advice of my late Parlt in respect to the disturbances of my American colonies have produced those salutary effects, wch relying upon the supposed wisdom of their deliberations I had been induced to expect. I therefore sent that Parlt a packing rather abruptly, & have called you in their place to pick a little advice out of your wise heads upon some matters of the greatest weight & importance relating to a sort of Crusade that I have upon my hands. I must needs tell you that the business if you chuse to undertake it for me will be a seven or ten years job at least. You must know then that my ministers have put me upon a project to undertake the reduction of the whole continent of North America to unconditional submission. They wd have persuaded me to coax you into this project by representing it to you as a matter very easily to be done in a twinkling, and to make you believe that my subjects in America whom you have always hitherto considered as brave men are no better than a wretched pack of cowardly run a ways, & that 500 men with whips wd make them all dance to the tune of Yankee Doodle; but I wd tell you no such thing because I am very sure if you meddle with it that you will find it a very different sort of business.

Now Gentlemen of the House of Commons I give you this fair notice for yourselves & your Constituents. If you undertake this job it will cost you at the least farthing a good round sum of 40 or 50 millions; 40 or 50 thousands of your Constituents will get knocked on the head and then you are to consider what the rest of you will be gainers by the bargain even if you succeed. The trade of a ruined & desolated Country is always inconsiderable, its revenue trifling; the expence of subjecting & retaining it in subjection certain & inevitable. On the other side shd you prove unsuccessful, shd that connexion wch we wish most ardently to maintain be dissolved, shd my Ministers exhaust your treasures & waste the blood of your Country men in vain will they not deliver you weak & defenceless to your natural enemies?

You must know this is not the first time that the Serpent has been whispering in to my ear, Tax America. Cost what it will, make them your hewers of wood & drawers of water. Let them feel that your little finger is thicker than the loins of all your ancestors. But I was wiser than all that. I sent to Ld Rockingham & the advice that he gave me was this, not to burn my fingers in the business. That it was ten to one against our making any hand of it at all, that they were not worth shearing & at best that we shd raise a cursed outcry & get but little wool. I shall remember his last advice to me as long as I live. Speak good words to them and they will be thy Servants forever.

And now my Lords & Gentlemen

I have stated the whole matter fairly & squarely before you. It is your own business, and if you are not content as you are, look to the rest for yourselves. But if I were to give you a word of advice it should be to remind you of the Italian Epitaph upon a poor fool that kill'd himself with quacking

Stava ben, por star meglio, sto qui.

that is to say. I was well, I would be better, I took Physick and died.

A NEW ERA IN COTTON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The greatest event in the history of cotton is Eli Whitney's invention of the cotton gin. Another great event, if not fully as great, is the discovery of a new system of baling cotton by which it is compressed as it leaves the gin-stand to twice the cubic density formerly attainable, and, without the old wrapping of heavy jute bagging and iron ties, but with only a simple neat cotton or burlap covering, it is ready for direct shipment to any part of the world. This system is commonly known as the "round bale."

Under the old system of baling cotton, we are taxed 6 per cent. on every bale of cotton we export. The foreigner buys cotton only. He will pay nothing for iron ties or jute bagging, but taxes every bale 6 per cent. tare for the weight of its wrapping. As cotton is by far the most valuable article for export this country has, the tax is a severe one. The value of our cotton exports for the past twenty years is $4,367,191,810. The tax the Southern planter has paid and this country has lost in gold amounts to the enormous sum of over $262,000,000. In the round or Lowry bale the covering weighs practically nothing, and there is no tare. The Southern farmer pays no tax.

A wrapping for cotton that has cost the country's wealth over a quarter of a billion dollars in twenty years should be a magnificent one. As a matter of fact, no great commodity has been handled in the barbarous (I do not speak extravagantly) way cotton has. It arrives at the mills badly exposed, in many cases the bagging almost entirely gone, and the cotton damaged from rain, mud, etc. In the round bale the package arrives at its destination in perfect condition. The farmer saves the loss from damage he used to pay. Because of the greater density of the new bale, ocean freights are one-third to one-half of the old rate. Insurance is also less. In Memphis the Board of Underwriters have recently reduced the rate to one-half that of the old. Every one of these savings is just so many dollars in the Southern farmer's pocket.

A radical revolution in the method of handling cotton cannot be accomplished in a moment. The enormous money investment in compresses will naturally endeavor to protect its interests. But the round or

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lowry bale is such an enormous stride along the path of progress that it is impossible to withstand it. Very few years can elapse before, necessarily, its use will be universal.

W. COLLIER ESTES.

MEMPHIS, TENN., February 1, 1899.

HORACE, DANTE, AND TENNYSON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Horace has insinuated himself into many a modern verse, and he was unquestionably "old" and "familiar" for Tennyson. The interesting suggestion of your correspondent, however (*Nation*, December 22, 1898), that the closing lines of "Ulysses" are a reminiscence of Teucer's address to the companions of his voyage (Odes, I., 7), at least needs qualification. Surely it is well recognized that the "Ulysses"—if we consider the poem as a whole—was inspired by the twenty-sixth canto of the "Inferno," while the passage in question is not so nearly related to Horace's verse as to the following (112 ff.):

> "O frati, dissi, che per cento milia
> Perigli siete giunti all' occidente,
> A questa tanto picciola vigilia
> De' vostri sensi ch' è del rimanente,
> Non vogliate negar l' esperienza,
> Diretro al Sol, del mondo senza gente."

Dante in his turn, it may be, has Horace in mind—Horace at any rate in this ode, as once or twice elsewhere, is strangely Dantesque; but again, a more obvious original is at hand. Dante knows Horace—at least he cares for him—chiefly as satirist and critic: if the present passage is not an exception, he apparently does not imitate him. Any coincidence, however, with the manner or the words of his *buon maestro* Virgil is at least direct, if not intentional. Here one naturally recalls the familiar verses in the 'Æneid' (I., 198 ff.):

> "O socii—neque enim ignari sumus ante malorum—
> O passi graviora, dabit deus his quoque finem," etc.

Whether these lines are a "charming reminiscence" of Horace's, or *vice versa*, is a more delicate and possibly insoluble question.

It need not be added that while Tennyson was more immediately influenced by Dante's Ulysses, he may well have felt the kinship of all three passages. E. K. R.

TOURS, FRANCE, January 15, 1899.

THE BEAST-LIKE SOUND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I do not remember ever to have seen a protest raised in the press against what seems to the writer a growing tendency, certainly here in the West, to use colloquially, instead of words, sounds termed fitly, I think, *beast-like*.

It strikes one as a sad (though doubtless an unconscious) combination of laziness and under-breeding to hear constantly the *hunh, hunh* of affirmation, the *unh, unh* of negation, and the everlasting *huugh?* of interrogation, besides the shades of meaning indicated by kindred sounds which quite fail of coherent expression. Some of these latter variants are, by the way, often amusing by their ingenious adaptation to the passing mood.

Parents early practise the whole gamut upon their children, and I have seen them take apparent hearty pleasure in the "beast-like" replies of the little ones. Teachers in the public schools are victims, and confirm their charges in this original sin. Young men in trade and professional life give free vent to this sound, and is it to be wondered that young women in society fairly chatter in it? But while rare among older men of position, it seems particularly attractive to women of all ranks and ages. Women of cultivation—indeed, of most gentle and refined manners—persist in introducing the sound to the marring of their English.

The writer hesitates somewhat in putting the matter before you thus at length—amid the general prevalency of the beast-like sound about him, he is indeed "a voice crying in the wilderness"; but possibly the attention of others may be arrested by a condition of our colloquial speech which many (deafened by the iteration of these sounds described) do not heed. At any rate, among your readers I feel sure of sympathy with my plaint.—Yours faithfully,

HENRY LEVERETT CHASE.

ST. LOUIS, January 26, 1899.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF RHYME.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your correspondent, Prof. Newcomer, settles the question between perfect and allowable rhymes very neatly by defining rhyme to be "recurrence of the same sounds," and leaving the similarity to be determined by the usage of recognized poets. Poetry is verse written by poets, and Shakspere and Burns are ultimate authorities in rhyming usage. The definition of a rhyme cannot be made *a priori*, but must be induced or generalized from an examination of the verse of those whom common consent calls poet.

Still, their usage is in accordance with certain principles or with the philosophy of the subject. What is the function of rhymes? First, the rhyme marks the termination of the lines, and, by manifold "combination and arrangements," enables us to form a great variety of stanzas, like the rime royale, the sonnet, the Spenserian, the French ballade and rondeau. The Greeks and Romans elaborated stanzaic forms without rhyme, but we cannot do so. These forms give pleasure by their ingenuity as well as by their metrical beauty. For this function of rhyme, perfect rhymes are not necessary. In fact, in one very pleasing form (the sestina), identical words in ingeniously changed sequences make the stanza.

The second function of rhyme is to give the pleasure which comes from the perception of temporal acoustic correspondences, or, in plain English, echoes. Leaving on one side the question how far this pleasure arises from the musical sense, and how far it arises from the gratification we take in ingenious constructions, an echo always gives pleasure. But an echo is never an exact repetition. Owing to the motion or changing density of the air, an echo is never a perfect rhyme, and part of the pleasure it gives comes from the very fact that the sound is modified when given back. It may be rather fanciful to say that the rhymes of poets are analogous to the echoes of nature, continually changing in tone and timbre, and seeming to come from something alive and not be struck out with the monotonous iteration of a hurdygurdy; but it is certain that neither is mechanically perfect, and that the lack of perfection is part of their charm.

However, this is a mechanical age, and I suppose we must have machine-made verse with perfect rhymes, as a "typical product." Fortunately, we are not compelled to read it, but can still enjoy "imperfect rhymes" in Burns's songs and Shakspere's Sonnets and "Venus and Adonis." Prof. Newcomer is undoubtedly right, too, in saying that there are very few absolutely perfect rhymes in our language, and that the similarity of the vowel sound in two words depends very much on the individual pronunciation. In other words, there are virtually only imperfect rhymes in English. CHARLES F. JOHNSON.

TRINITY COLLEGE, HARTFORD, January 30, 1899.

Notes.

M. F. Mansfield & A. Wessels issue immediately 'Studies of the Mind and Art of Robert Browning,' by James Fotheringham; 'Aubrey Beardsley,' by Arthur Symons; 'The Story of the West Indies,' by Arnold Kennedy; and 'The Long White Cloud (New Zealand),' by the Hon. William Pember Reeves.

Dodd, Mead & Co.'s spring list embraces Ruskin's Letters to Rossetti and other of his contemporaries; a translation of Joubert's 'Thoughts'; 'Songs of the Rappahannock,' stories by Ira S. Dodd; and a new volume of poems by Paul Laurence Dunbar.

Macmillan Co. announce a translation of Joseph Texte's 'Jean Jacques Rousseau, and the Origins of the Cosmopolitan Spirit in Literature,' by J. W. Matthews; and an 'Elementary History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great,' by C. Oman.

'In Cuba with Shafter,' by Lieut.-Col. J. D. Miley of the General's staff; 'A History of Yiddish Literature in the Nineteenth Century,' by Prof. Leo Wiener of Harvard; and 'The Orchestra and Orchestral Music,' by W. J. Henderson (in the "Music-Lover's Library") will be published by Charles Scribner's Sons.

A. C. Armstrong & Son will soon bring out 'Book Auctions in the Seventeenth Century,' by John Lawler (in the "Book-Lovers' Library"), and 'Neglected Factors in the Study of the Early Progress of Christianity,' by Prof. James Orr.

Among the works promised for the coming season by the New Amsterdam Book Co. are 'Dickens and his Illustrators,' by Frederick G. Kitton, containing twenty-two portraits and seventy original drawings, with sketches of each artist's career; 'Twenty Years in the Near East,' by Ardern G. Hulme Beaman; 'British West Africa,' by Major A. F. Mockler-Ferryman; 'The Downfall of the Dervishes,' by E. N. Bennett; 'Two Native Narratives of the Indian Mutiny at Delhi,' translated by the late Charles T. Metcalfe; 'Annals of Eton College,' by Wasey Sterry; 'Memoirs of Admiral the Right Hon. Sir Astley Cooper Key,' by Vice-Admiral P. H. Colomb; 'The Canon Law in England,' by Prof. F. W. Maitland; 'Reading and Readers,' by Clifford Harrison; and 'Dante's Garden,' by Rosamond Cotes.

From Doubleday & McClure Co. we are to have 'The Fight for Santiago,' by Stephen Bonsal; 'How to Plan the Home Grounds,' by S. Parsons; 'Through the Turf Smoke,' Irish peasant stories by Seumas MacManus; and Dr. Maurice Jokai's 'Hungarian Nabob,' translated by R. Nisbet Bain.

J. F. Taylor & Co., No. 66 Fifth Avenue,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New York, have in hand a new uniform edition of the Novels and Poems of Charles Kingsley, supplemented by the Letters and Memoirs of his Life, edited by his wife. This "Westminster Edition" will fill fourteen medium 8vo volumes, printed from new type at the University Press, Cambridge. There will be numerous illustrations by Zeigler, Reich, and others. The number of sets will be limited to one thousand.

"Beacon Biographies" is the name selected for short lives of eminent Americans contemplated by Small, Maynard & Co., Boston, under the general editorship of M. A. De Wolfe Howe, as, 'Daniel Webster,' by Norman Hapgood; 'J. R. Lowell,' by Prof. E. E. Hale, jr.; 'R. E. Lee,' by Prof. W. P. Trent, etc. 'The Memory of Lincoln,' by the same firm and editor, will consist of the very best poems which have to do with Lincoln. Finally, Washington's Farewell Address, with an introduction by Worthington C. Ford, will bear the same imprint.

The handiness of the size of the dozen little volumes of the "Camberwell Edition" of Browning's Complete Works (T. Y. Crowell & Co.) is first to be commended in this venture. The outward appearance also is attractive, and the type is sufficiently large and clear, although the quality of the paper does not permit an elegant impression. The editors, Charlotte Porter and Helen A. Clarke, have supplied "arguments" to the longer pieces, and superabundant notes for followers of the cult if not for school use. The lines are numbered. We must not forget to add that a pretty photogravure frontispiece—portrait, scene from nature, painting, or what not—adorns each booklet.

A new edition of Luce's 'Seamanship,' fourth in number, revised by Lieut. W. S. Benson, U. S. N., has been issued by the D. Van Nostrand Co., after an interval of fourteen years from the previous one. This textbook, which is still prefaced by a short note from its distinguished author, Rear-Admiral S. B. Luce, U. S. N., has been brought up to date and to the battle-ship era without omitting anything of value concerning the handling of craft of various kinds under sail alone. Its value would be still further enhanced by a fuller treatment of the handling and qualities of vessels of two and three screws based upon experience and the discussions in the *Revue Maritime*, but it still easily maintains its lead as the best textbook of the kind in the language. Its appendix has been rendered especially valuable by the part relating to the definition of technical terms used in modern naval construction.

Albert Lavignac's 'The Music Dramas of Richard Wagner and his Festival Theatre in Bayreuth' (Dodd, Mead & Co.) is a book for which there ought to be a brisk demand this season when we are having Nibelung cycles, and Wagner operas two or three times a week. M. Lavignac is professor of harmony at the Paris Conservatory, and as the Parisians are just at present perhaps the most enthusiastic of all Wagnerites, his volume was warmly welcomed there. Esther Singleton has made a readable English version of it, retaining all the musical examples as well as the pictures and portraits, adding to the latter one of the late Anton Seidl, as the latest addition to the list of Bayreuth conductors. Only two days before his death Mr. Seidl wrote to the translator giving some information about Bayreuth which is printed on p. 510. M. Lavignac begins his volume with a sketch of life in Bayreuth, which is followed by the story of Wagner's life, briefly told. Then follow analyses of the poems and music of the operas from "Tannhäuser" to "Parsifal," written with French lucidity, and avoiding technicalities as far as possible. In his naming of the Leitmotive he does not always follow Wolzogen's lead, but that is no ground for complaint. The appendix contains Bayreuth casts from 1876 to the present day; also tables of Bayreuth rehearsals, with other information not accessible elsewhere. In brief, M. Lavignac has justified his temerity in writing "the thousand and first book on Wagner."

'Leslie's History of the Greater New York,' by Daniel Van Pelt (Arkell Publishing Co.), disposes of New York proper in one volume and of the outlying boroughs in another. The work is frankly a popular compilation, not a philosophical history in any sense. For example, the career of Tweed and his gang is rehearsed justly and in proper reprobation, but the continuity between Tweed and Croker, or between the ring system and the boss system, is not even suggested. In fact, Croker's name does not, we believe, appear in these pages—but there is no index. Apropos of Tweed, it is well to be reminded that Spain extradited him for punishment in courteous excess of treaty requirements. These volumes are freely and not badly illustrated.

A checkered fate is revealed in the history of Norwich University, compiled by William A. Ellis, B.S. (Concord, N. H.: Rumford Press). This institution has more than once changed its name and its location—from Vermont to Connecticut, and then back to Vermont; from Norwich to Middletown and Northfield. Its original style was "The American Literary, Scientific, and Military Academy"; for a time in distress and deeply indebted to a succoring alumnus, it was dubbed Lewis College. The institution, founded in 1819, has been a feeder to West Point and Annapolis, and its alumni, graduates, and non-graduates, took part in all our wars following that of 1812. Rear-Admiral Dewey is in the latter class, and there are at least three who attained equal rank in the navy—Carpenter, Hiram Paulding, and Boggs. Many of the lesser generals of the civil war; politicians like W. Pitt Kellogg, and Horatio Seymour, and Gideon Welles; notable scholars, clergymen, and men of science, are scattered up and down the biographical sketches here painstakingly put together, with very interesting portraits (often of an early and a later date). Several chapters of reminiscence supplement the introductory chronicle of the University. The work is a useful addition to its kind, and is handsomely printed and illustrated.

The value of the files of the *Library Journal* to the profession has been greatly enhanced by the publication of a 'General Index' (New York) to the twenty-two volumes ending with December, 1897. The early volumes of this series are now rarities, and the Index will at least show him who consults it some part of what they contain on the subjects he is interested in. It is not, however, a compound of the annual indexes, which must still be resorted to for certain details. The compiler, Mr. F. J. Teggart, now the librarian of the Mechanics' Institute, San Francisco, has made a free offering of the fruit of his labors, originally undertaken for his own use. The latest volume was indexed by Miss Helen E. Haines, managing editor of the *Journal*. The page is printed in two columns, one blank to allow of additions.

Some years ago several fine specimens of historical fiction that betrayed a wonderfully accurate knowledge of the details of church and secular history appeared in Germany and attracted general attention; but for a long time it was not known to the literary world that the "George Taylor" who professed to be the author was none other than Prof. Adolf Hausrath, the Heidelberg church historian. With the sole exception of the late Prof. Ebers, the Leipzig and Munich Egyptologist, Hausrath was the only University man who had successfully utilized his minute investigations for the purposes of fiction; and he possessed the advantage over Ebers that he did not modernize his characters in thought and action. Hausrath has recently brought out a new novel, entitled 'Pater Maternus,' "a romance of the seventeenth century." The scene is laid in Italy, and depicts the experiences of a young Augustinian monk, who goes to Rome to find peace for his soul, and finds it there—not where he expected, but in the house of a converted Jew. Hausrath is peculiarly happy in a piquant style, reminding the reader of Renan. In 'Pater Maternus' the author evidently had in mind the personality and experiences of Luther.

Tennant & Ward, New York, announce for March 1 a new monthly magazine, the *Photo-Miniature*. The first number will treat of Modern Lenses, and each issue will be a like monograph pertaining to the theory or practice of photography.

Rhodora is the name of a new monthly journal published by the New England Botanical Club under the editorship of Dr. Benjamin Lincoln Robinson, curator of the Gray Herbarium of Harvard University. Its aim is to further the study of the local flora. Among the contents of the initial number are brief articles on "Rattlesnake-plantains," "A New Wild Lettuce," each with a plate, as well as notes on "Fleshy Fungi near Boston" and on "New England Algæ." Among the contributors are Dr. Robinson, Merritt L. Fernald, and Hollis Webster of Harvard University.

Petermann's Mitteilungen, number twelve, contains the concluding parts of the monograph on West African culture by L. Frobenius, and the account, by N. A. Busch, of his journey in the northwestern Caucasus. There is also the useful index of the geographical literature of 1898, which shows a large increase of noteworthy works over the previous year. Out of the 884 titles, 176 relate to works on universal geography, 294 to Europe, 94 to Asia, 82 to Africa, and 53 to the United States.

Nine articles on the political situation in Austria by Dr. Max Menger, originally published in the *Neues Wiener Tageblatt*, in June and July, 1898, have been reprinted in pamphlet form (Vienna: Steyrermühl), and form a convenient means of gaining an insight into the critical condition of Austrian affairs. An appendix contains the several ministerial decrees concerning the use of the German and the Czechic languages in Bohemia and Moravia.

The opening of the first free public library and reading-room in the large and wealthy city of Nürnberg makes one reflect with wonderment on the almost universal lack of such institutions in German cities. This is, no doubt, to be accounted for by the exist-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ence of so many excellent libraries, open to scholars and the higher classes generally, and of the popular Leihbibliotheken, which, to a certain extent, meet the wants of the middle and lower classes. The foundation of free public libraries of a higher order, with well-appointed reading-rooms, however, has commenced at last, with the result of proving that a real demand for them exists. At Nürnberg the opening of the first was even immediately followed by the demand for a second in another part of the city.

The university statistics of Germany for the current winter semester give little promise of the speedy solution of the "learned proletariat" question, which has vexed and perplexed the authorities for a decade and more. There has been, during all these years, an overproduction of university graduates, an excess of supply over demand. The state has been able to utilize only a certain portion of the finely educated specialists who offered their services in the departments of theology, law, medicine, and the various branches found combined in the philosophical faculties. Bismarck on more than one occasion declared in Parliament that these disappointed graduates furnished the brains of the Social Democratic party. Accordingly the authorities have been rather discouraging than encouraging attendance at the universities, and have proposed in various ways to make admittance more difficult, *e. g.*, by denying it to the graduates of the Real or scientific schools, and admitting only those who had finished the Gymnasium or classical course. Notwithstanding all this, the attendance has steadily increased, and now has reached the high-water mark in 32,233 matriculated students, or more than a thousand beyond the contingent reported last winter, when it was 31,110.

Miss Alice Bache Gould having given to the National Academy of Sciences more than a year ago the sum of $20,000 to establish a fund to be known as the Benjamin Apthorp Gould Fund, in memory of her father, a sufficient available income has now accrued to warrant beginning its distribution, in accordance with the terms of the trust and a letter of instructions from the donor, to assist in the prosecution of researches in astronomy. Prof. Lewis Boss of Albany, Dr. S. C. Chandler of Cambridge, and Prof. Asaph Hall, formerly of Washington, are the directors of the trust, and they are now prepared to receive and consider applications for appropriations. The objects of the Fund are, first to advance the science of astronomy; second, to honor the memory of Dr. Gould by insuring that his power to accomplish scientific work shall not end with his death. Work in the astronomy of precision is to be given the preference in all cases over any work in astrophysics, both because of Dr. Gould's especial predilection and because of the present existence of generous endowments for astrophysics. In recognition of the fact that during his lifetime Dr. Gould's patriotic feeling and ambition to promote the progress of his chosen science were closely associated, it is preferred that the fund be used primarily for the benefit of investigators in his own country, or of his own nationality. As, however, it is recognized that sometimes the best possible service to American science is the maintenance of close communion between the scientific men of Europe and of America, even while acting in the spirit of this restriction the directors may occasionally judge it best to make a grant in aid of a foreign investigator working abroad.

The regulations for the award of the Rinehart scholarship in sculpture in 1899 have just been issued by the Rinehart Committee, Peabody Institute, Baltimore. We cannot summarize them further than to say that examples of work by candidates—"relief, figure in the round, and drawings"—must be sent to W. S. Budworth & Son, No. 424 West Fifty-second Street, New York, marked "*Rinehart Scholarship*," *on or before* March 25 proximo. The scholarship yields $1,200 per annum and may be held for four years, with lodging in the Villa dell' Aurora, the home of the American Academy in Rome.

—*Harper's Monthly* for February opens with an illustrated article of some interest on "Lieut.-Col. Forrest at Fort Donelson"—a condensed chapter from a life of General Forrest by Dr. John A. Wyeth. The point of the paper is that the Confederate troops surrendered were sacrificed unnecessarily; that they might all have escaped, as Forrest and his men did, quite unmolested by the Federal army. The author seems to have accumulated a mass of evidence on the subject, and if he is right, of course what happened afterwards might have been different; but the main thing was the loss of the fort, and to prove that this might have been saved is a pretty difficult task. Of one thing there is no doubt, that Forrest refused to surrender, and expressed the opinion at the time in his report that, had the Confederates renewed the fight the next day, they would have gained a victory, "as our troops were *in fine spirits, believing* we had whipped them." Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, who has just finished a history of the Revolution, begins his "Spanish-American War." His historical style is not unlike that of a good many others, but his idea of turning historian to justify his own political course is a good one. His Massachusetts vassals will read this history with varied emotions. What we enjoy most about him is his ingenuity. He says of the *Maine*, that had Spain shown "a generous sympathy" and made "a prompt offer" of reparation, she might have saved herself. Now, any one would imagine from this that Spain refused sympathy and made no offer. The fact, of course, is that Spain offered to submit the whole matter to arbitration, and abide by the result, whatever it might be. But let no one charge Mr. Lodge with misrepresentation; what he said was *generous* sympathy, and a *prompt* offer; the sympathy was not generous enough, and the offer should have been two days or so earlier. Again, he gives an account of the *Virginius* case, in which he says that war was averted because "the forces which cared nothing for humanity and a good deal for an undisturbed money market prevailed." The fact, of course, was that Spain acceded to all our demands, and we could not go to war, because, as our Gibbon says in his next sentence, the papers of the *Virginius* proved to be fraudulent. She was not an American ship. Mr. Lodge accuses the Cleveland Administration of "neglect of the cases of American prisoners" in Cuba. Now, Dr. José Ignacio Rodriguez, who was counsel for one of these prisoners, the celebrated Julio Sanguily, and himself took part in the former Cuban Revolution, who has for many years resided in Washington, and who recently accompanied our Peace Commission to Paris as an expert in Spanish law, wrote a full account in 1897 of this case of Sanguily. Speaking of himself as counsel, he says on page 55 of his pamphlet: "He knew by his own personal experience, covering more than a quarter of a century of daily contact with the State Department, not to say anything of historical teachings, that in the matter of protection to American citizens against injustice and oppression on the part of Spain, and in the fulfilment of this duty, manly [manfully?] as well as efficiently, the Administration of Mr. Cleveland, with Secretary of State Mr. Gresham and Secretary of State Mr. Olney, has a record which its enemies cannot obscure, and which challenges comparison with that of all the other administrations which preceded it."

—The Reminiscences of Julia Ward Howe, of which the third instalment appears in the *Atlantic* for this month, carry us back to a society now almost obliterated, that of the London of 1842-3, when Sydney Smith was in his prime, when the English of American guests was still curiously listened to and benevolently corrected, when the story of Laura Bridgman was new, when Carlyle was beginning his career, and Macready was acting *Claude Melnotte*, and Fanny Elssler was dancing, and Almack's was in its glory, and Charles Sumner was a young man—according to Carlyle "a vera dull man," of promise. Americans then went abroad well provided with letters of introduction, and, besides this, Mr. Howe, as his wife observes, was then "a first-class lion." Perhaps as curious an anecdote of manners as any is one of Dickens's behavior on hearing Mrs. Howe interject a term of endearment in some remark addressed to her husband. "Dickens slid down to the floor, and, lying on his back, held up one of his small feet, quivering with pretended emotion: 'Did she call him "darling"?' he cried." According to Sydney Smith, Mrs. Howe made only one slip in pronunciation. She should have called the House of Lords "the House of Lards." Purveyors of realistic fiction will find the collection of "Farewell Letters of the Guillotined" worth study. They are a mass of letters from the victims of the Reign of Terror, written by them just before being executed; they show that people brought face to face with inevitable death become calm, not excited. "Only in one instance is there a breath of malediction." "The Subtle Problem of Charity," by Jane Addams, is valuable chiefly as giving a striking picture of the essential contrast between the worlds in which the well-to-do and the poor live. In one case the only plausible explanation which suggested itself of the charitable efforts of a "visitor" was that the beneficiary had discovered an awful family secret involving her, and that the charity was merely disguised blackmail. One economical point is that the rich avoid early marriages partly because they do not want too many dependent children; the poor marry early partly because they hope that some of their children may soon contribute to the family purse, and perhaps support their parents in their old age. In other words, among the poor, children are, or are thought to be, so much potential capital.

—The Hon. George F. Hoar contributes to *Scribner's* his reminiscences of "Four National Conventions," 1876-1888. His constitutional dislike to say anything unpleasant about members of his own party prevents his giving an effective account of the struggles which have rent it during the last twenty

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years. Of Mr. Blaine, after his defeat for the Presidency, he makes the curious remark that "his subsequent career in the Department of State, I believe, satisfied the majority of his countrymen that he would have made an able and discreet President." Of Garfield he says that he has heard men who knew him very well when the leader of the House, say that they never could feel sure that "he would not get wrong at the last moment, or have some private understanding with the Democrats and leave his own side in the lurch." This, he says, he feels sure was a great mistake. "Garfield's hesitation, want of certainty in his convictions, liability to change his position suddenly, were in my opinion the results of intellectual hesitation, and of a habit of going down to the roots of his subject before he made up his mind." Mr. W. C. Brownell's essay on Thackeray is the most substantial piece of writing in the number. It is useless to attempt to quote from it, especially as Mr. Brownell's method is not that of definition or epigram. Perhaps part of it might be summed up by saying that while the great dramatists give us real characters, the novel of Thackeray gives us real characters plus the showman, who happens to be also a great humorist, a man of the world, and a poet, too, for that matter.

—The *Century* has for its leading illustrated article an account, by Frederic Courtland Penfield, formerly United States Diplomatic Agent and Consul-General, of the steps being taken to enlarge the cultivable area of Egypt. Among the pictures, by R. Talbot Kelly, is one of Philæ as it is, but as it will no longer be after the great dam at Assuan is constructed. What Mr. Penfield calls the "practical Egypt" is a small country—the ribbon-like strip of alluvial land bordering the Nile, measuring not more than 10,500 square miles (barely as much as the States of Vermont and Rhode Island together); while the extension planned, and to be completed in the next six or eight years, will add some 2,500 miles more. Gen. Shafter gives a long account of "The Capture of Santiago de Cuba," which is a very colorless reply to his critics. He declares in substance that he managed the campaign well, and that the celebrated "round robin" was merely a reaffirmation by his officers of opinions already expressed to them by their commander. When he telegraphed to Washington that he was "seriously considering withdrawing about five miles and taking up a new position," he was actually "preparing to push the siege," and, hearing about this time that Cervera had "gone to his doom," he dashed on to victory.

—The January issue of the Oxford English Dictionary (New York: Henry Frowde) carries the letter H to Hod, and Dr. Murray promises the remainder by July 1. Few instalments have better exhibited the historical richness of this word-book. We pass over the bewildering variety of forms of the pronoun of the third person, mostly obsolete (like *hisn* and *hern*); we refer rather to such information as is to be found under Hell, where is set forth its Biblical translation of Jewish and Christian use; under the much controverted Hide (of land); under the (Cossack) Hetman, captain, and (Polish) Heyduck, brigand, and obsolete (Old English) Henchman, muleteer or groom, revived by Scott with a Scotch twist as gillie, and given a political partisan sense in this country; under Highness, where the application of the title is nicely explained; under Hill, where we are told that in England any eminence, to be a mountain, must exceed 2,000 feet; under Heresy, whose "earlier sense-development from 'religious sect, party, or faction,' to 'doctrine at variance with the Catholic faith' lies outside English," and Heretic, in which "the position of the stress, as differing from words immediately from Greek or Latin, such as *ascetic, theoretic*," is due to derivation through the French; under High (a remarkably long article), where Chaucer is shown to have set the pace for Spenser in squaring his orthography with his rhyme, using "both *heigh* (*hey*) riming with *seigh* saw, and *hy, hye* riming with *Emelye*, etc." It is curious to learn that Hockey makes an isolated appearance in 1527, and recurs first with Cowper in 1785; that Hereabout (1225) and Hereaway (1483) took on a final *s* first in 1584 and 1613 respectively; that Helpmeet is a nineteenth-century word, and not found in Webster as late as 1832; that the substantive Hem is as old as 1,000, while the verb, to edge, is not known before the fifteenth century; that the verb Hem, to clear the throat, dates from 1470, the interjection Hem! only from 1526 (Skelton). This latter date is posterior to the publication of Erasmus's 'Colloquies,' but the interjection is English, and the great Dutchman had already made his two sojourns in England. We may, therefore, suspect that he there picked up the word for the colloquy, "Virgo Pœnitens," where we read: "Hem, male sit huic tussi" (Hem! hang this cough). The word being foreign alike to Latin (in this sense) and to the Continent, the editors of the 'Colloquies' found it necessary to explain this "aside" as "feigning a cough" (so the Amsterdam Elzevir 1662, and even Roger Daniel's London edition of 1655). *Per contra*, Dr. Murray records no sign that another neologism of Erasmus's, in "Abbatis et Eruditæ," viz., the use of *heroïnarum* in the sense of 'great court ladies,' has affected our English Heroine at any period. "Potentes aulicas, quasi semideas," is the Elzevir gloss, and Daniel's likewise. It was, by the way, another Daniel (Samuel), in his 'Defence of Ryme,' who flouted Erasmus as having "brought no more wisdome into the world with all [his] new revived words than we find was before."

—If George Herbert, in 1633, depicted Hell as "full of good meanings and wishings," it was Johnson in Boswell who paved the place with good intentions. "Hell of a row" has been detected in the *Morning Post* of June 26, 1810, two years before James and Horace Smith's pun in the 'Rejected Addresses' ("Punch's Apotheosis"):

"I'm Juliet Capulet, who took a dose of hellebore—
A hell-of-a-bore I found it to put on a pall."

Among the compounds we look in vain for Hell-bent, as "Maine went for Governor Kent." But America has been by no means neglected. Richard Grant White's Heterophemy is here, and Peter Herdic's vehicle named for him; Old Hickory, and Hicksite; Emerson's "hitch his wagon to a star"; Heeler, ascribed to the New York *Herald* in 1877; Hired (man), which is treated at considerable length as a notable Americanism; Highfalutin; and Highbinder, to which Poe gave the clue, proving the name to have been adopted by a gang of New York ruffians on the North River side of lower Broadway in 1805. The word has now changed its coast and its nationality—*cœlum, non animum*—designating (since 1887 at latest) a secret gang of Chinese desperadoes in California. The vehicle of this transmigration will probably always remain a mystery. American, too, is our telephone call, Hello!, though it is making its way in England, as is shown by a quotation from Mary Kingsley along with "Are you there?" "Who's there?" is also common in England, we believe. In Germany the formula is self-introductory—"Here is ——." Under Heterodoxy we find quoted from Carlyle's French Revolution (1837) "the difference between Orthodoxy or *Mydoxy* and Heterodoxy or *Thy-doxy*." When Orthodoxy in turn is reached, we may hope to meet with Franklin's original version of this pleasantry ("Orthodoxy is my doxy, and heterodoxy is your doxy," given as one of Franklin's "definitions" in John Adams's diary, November 30, 1779, Works, 1851, iii., 186).

—It is well known that Dr. Karl Dändliker of Zurich, the author of a learned 'Geschichte der Schweiz' in three volumes, has also written a manual of Swiss history which, like his larger work, is held to be a standard authority by German readers. We announce with great pleasure the appearance in English form of this one-volume sketch. The translation is entitled 'A Short History of Switzerland,' and has been made by E. Salisbury (Macmillan). The chief cause of the satisfaction which we feel at the appearance of this book is quickly stated. To the best of our knowledge no thorough study of Swiss history (leaving aside essays or monographs on constitutional topics) has yet been published by an English-speaking author. One could easily recall the titles of several books which make pretensions, but in no case are we aware that fulness of erudition is a chief characteristic. In all of them the hand of the book-maker rather than that of the mature scholar is apparent. Mr. W. A. B. Coolidge's notices of the separate cantons in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' and his articles in the *English Historical Review*, alone show adequate information; but, unfortunately, they are not comprehensive. Moreover, we lack, in English, translations of Vulliemin, Rilliet, Dändliker (the *opus*), and Dierauer. Translations should not be permitted to take the place of original works in one's own language, but in the present instance we welcome a good epitome of Swiss history from whatever source it comes. Concerning Dändliker's scope and the quality of his writing, much might be said were this the proper place for an extensive review. He is not picturesque nor even animated, but he is clear—and that statement carries high praise when applied to a history of Switzerland. For complexity of topics the cantons hardly equal the towns of mediæval Italy, and yet the two may be brought into comparison. Cave-dwellers, lake-dwellers, Helvetii, Romans, Alamanni, Burgundians, and Franks are easily managed; nor does the League of Forest Cantons present much difficulty. But when the earlier *Bund* becomes one of eight, and this again a *Bund* of thirteen, the threads mingle so blindly that skill is required in keeping the clue. Dändliker, besides being a master of the facts, is intelligent and intelligible. It follows that the sketch now translated should take rank before any other manual which is available in English. The English ver-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sion of it must also be commended for smoothness and accuracy.

BISMARCK'S REFLECTIONS AND REMINISCENCES.

Bismarck, the Man and the Statesman: Being the Reflections and Reminiscences of Otto, Prince von Bismarck; written and dictated by himself after his retirement from office. Translated from the German under the supervision of A. J. Butler, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Two volumes, xxi, 415; xx, 362 pp. Harper & Bros. 1899.

Bismarck was a nervous man, even by the American standard; and his life was an incessant struggle for self-control. When the policy of the Government was strongly attacked in the German Parliament, and his attention, as often happened, was so wholly centred upon his opponent that he forgot himself, he was wont to display his irritation and impatience in every line and movement of his face and body; and when, almost before the last sentence of the attack was ended, his huge form lurched up, the auditor who was unfamiliar with the Chancellor's characteristics naturally expected an outburst of invective. Bismarck, however, invariably began his reply in a tranquil tone, meeting his adversary's arguments either with a dispassionate statement of the facts as he viewed them, or with gentle and apparently good-humored persiflage. At the moment when the strain of waiting was over and the responsibility of public speech began, the life-long habit of self-mastery asserted itself.

Something of the surprise which strangers in the galleries of the Reichstag always felt on such occasions will undoubtedly be aroused in the reader who lays down Busch's diary and takes up Bismarck's memoirs. As Busch displays him, Bismarck was intolerant of differences of opinion, impatient at the least delay in the realization of his purposes, and unable to see any good qualities in those who crossed his policy. In his own book Bismarck discusses his political struggles with perfect calmness; describes his royal masters and their consorts, his associates and his enemies, with apparent freedom from prejudice, or at least with an obvious effort at faithful portraiture; and writes throughout, as he spoke in the Reichstag, with almost perfect self-control and in a tone and manner that are worthy of his position and his career. The difference is owing partly, of course, to the mere interval of time, but mainly to the sobering sense of responsibility. To an underling like "little Busch," supposed to be devoted and trusty, he might say anything; to the German public and to future generations he would say nothing that was not seemly. As far as the manner is concerned, he has, in fact, said nothing unseemly, not even of Augusta. As regards the matter, it may be questioned whether he has not, in her case, made revelations which a good royalist should have suppressed. How he has dealt with William II., we do not as yet know, for the memoirs close with the reign of Frederick III. It has been stated, in the German press, that a third volume exists, but that the family does not intend to publish it at present.

To the historian the chief value of Bismarck's reminiscences will be found in the fact that upon some important points they substitute direct for indirect evidence, and personal for hearsay testimony. Apart from this, it cannot be said that the book makes any important contribution to our knowledge of events or of their causes. Bismarck's Frankfort dispatches and Sybel's history, to say nothing of the letters and memoirs of other participants in the political life of the period, had practically covered the ground down to 1870. For the following decades there were, indeed, no publications of the same authority. But Bismarck's diplomacy was, on the whole, unusually above-board; his indiscretions, if revelations that were for the most part deliberate can be so termed, were numerous; and after his retirement from office he inspired not only occasional editorials and magazine articles, but solid books like Blum's. So much, therefore, had already been told that there was really little left to tell, and in his reminiscences Bismarck attempts no complete or even connected narration. He aims at little more than to furnish supplementary material, to throw side-lights upon events, and to make us better acquainted with the personal influences that were operative in the courts and in diplomacy.

What weight the historian is to attach to the new matter is a question that the future historian will have to settle for himself. So much, however, is already clear: no such falsification of history has been attempted as Busch's book had led the public, or a part of the public, to expect. Nor are the charges that have already appeared in German reviews of the book—charges of *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi*—to be taken as more authoritative than Bismarck's own story. It goes without saying that no man, however honest his effort, can describe the events of his own life with absolute veracity. They arrange themselves in his own mind, in greater or less degree, as they should have been. This process of rearrangement, however, has been going on, not in Bismarck's mind only, but also in the minds of all the surviving participants in the events which Bismarck describes; and the resultant divergence of recollections is a phenomenon with which historians are as familiar as are courts of justice. In one direction only does it appear that Bismarck has consciously suppressed—or rather ignored—a part of the truth. Like Sybel, he lays much stress upon the Prussian efforts from 1862 to 1866 to reach an understanding with Austria; and he at least permits the reader to assume that his real object during these years was rather to divide with Austria the control of Germany than to expel Austria from Germany. Again, in stating his reasons for forcing France to declare war in 1870, he passes over the fact which to the ordinary mind would appear to constitute his best reason—the fact that negotiations were in progress for a French-Austrian-Italian coalition against Prussia. It is conceivable that Bismarck is moved in both instances, as Sybel doubtless was in the first, by the desire to avoid offence to Germany's chief ally.

Bismarck's conjectures regarding things that he could not know, are of course entitled to little weight as compared with his testimony about things that he at least might have known. The motives and aims which he ascribes to his opponents in the palace, in Parliament, and in the army, are necessarily hypothetical. Bismarck was a good guesser: a great deal of his success in diplomacy was due to the accuracy of his guesses; but the best guess is something short of evidence. Assuming that Bismarck has told us only what he believed, we still have difficulty in accepting all the "intrigues" of chapter xxvi. An alliance between Protestant Tories and Ultramontanes, such as occurred after Bismarck's retirement, may well have been preparing in 1878; the Empress Augusta would naturally have favored such an alliance; but we cannot believe that the National Liberal leaders (cf. vol. ii., pp. 206, 216) were in such uncongenial company. There can, we think, be little doubt that, after his fall from power, which was doubtless preceded by much pulling of wires and exercise of back-stairs influence, Bismarck had in his old age a touch of the commonest of delusions—that of persecution. We have the first hint in Busch (vol. ii., p. 514), when Bismarck declares, just before his resignation, that he is sending off his papers to avoid a probable seizure! This delusion rapidly extended backward and colored Bismarck's view of antecedent facts. In Blum's book, which was largely inspired by the Prince after his retirement, there were nearly as many conspiracies as in the present reminiscences.

Closely allied with this disposition to discover intrigues is the emphasis everywhere laid on personal influence as a factor in determining the course of events. In this, however, there is no suggestion of anything less than perfect sanity of judgment. Bismarck is making no guesses and advancing no theory; he is simply giving us the result of his experience. His own career, his own influence in shaping history, have been a striking demonstration of the one-sidedness of Tolstoi's saying, that great names are merely the labels that we affix to events. Bismarck's reminiscences reinforce the demonstration by showing the influence exercised by lesser men in high places. His reflections drive the lesson home: no one can read his acute criticism of Prussian policy from 1790 to 1859 without seeing how different the course of events must have been if the third Frederick William had been less dense, the fourth less erratic, and both of them more willing to take risks. This insistence on the personal element lends to the story in many passages a dramatic interest that few histories possess; and the masterly studies of the chief actors will make the book live as literature. Frederick William IV., William I., Augusta, and Gortchakoff, for example, have become as real, in these pages, as any characters in fiction; and they are made real after the best literary fashion, not so much by direct description, good as this is, as by their acts and words in little matters.

In the same way, Bismarck makes himself real; and perhaps the most interesting question that the book raises is this: How far does Bismarck's Bismarck, as revealed in these reminiscences, differ from the Bismarck that we have already known? Here again we can only say, as we have said of the contribution the book makes to our knowledge of history, that we obtain from it new data, but nothing to change our general impressions. We find a nature fundamentally aristocratic. We find an intellect of marvellous clearness, that sees things exactly as they are, not warped by prejudice or colored by desire. We find a constructive imagination of the highest order, which enables its possessor to divine things he does not know, and to foresee things he cannot reason out. We find a temperament of restless energy; a will of iron, or rather of steel, because it is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

supple; and a courage that often seems audacity. On the side of morals we discern, as in the case of all greatly successful statesmen, a sharp if unexpressed distinction between private and public affairs. In public affairs, the only test of right is advantage—not, of course, the advantage of the statesman, not even the advantage of the king, but the advantage of the state. This, in Bismarck's case, was not simply the state whose affairs he was administering; not simply Prussia, from 1862 to 1866; not simply the North German Union, from 1866 to 1870; but the state that he aimed to create—the national German State.

Bismarck's "realism," as it has often been called, finds striking expression in chapter xii., in which he describes the loyalty of the average German to his dynasty, and explains the absurdity of the attempt to unify Germany over the heads of all the dynasties:

> "Whatever may be the origin of this factitious union of particularist elements, its result is that the individual German readily obeys the command of a dynasty to harry with fire and sword, and with his own hands to slaughter his German neighbors and kinsfolk, as a result of quarrels unintelligible to himself. *To examine whether this characteristic be capable of rational justification is not the problem of a German statesman, so long as it is strongly enough pronounced for him to reckon upon it*" (vol. i., p. 324).

The italics are ours. The adjective "factitious," by the way, which suggests a judgment, is interpolated by the translator; there is no warrant for it in the "partikularistische Zusammengehörigkeit" of the original.

Of Bismarck's frankly avowed disregard of interests other than German, an excellent illustration is given in chapter xv., which deals with the Polish question. He explains that, in the early sixties, there were at the Russian Court two parties: the one friendly to Poland and to constitutional government both in Poland and in Russia; the other hostile to Poland and devoted to absolutism. The former party was inclined to a French alliance; the latter to a Prussian. "It was our interest," Bismarck writes, "to oppose the party in the Russian Cabinet which had Polish proclivities" (vol. i., p. 340). He therefore used all his influence, first as Ambassador and afterwards as Premier, to frustrate the reform of Polish and of Russian institutions. It is possible that the programme of the Polonophils was not in Russia's interest; it may be that Poland was irreconcilable, and Russia itself unripe for constitutional government; but Bismarck does not consider it necessary to discuss these questions. "It was our interest" is final. His duty was to Prussia; not to Poland or to Russia or to humanity.

The title which Bismarck gives his book is exactly descriptive of its contents. He has not attempted to write his own life or the history of his time; he has simply given us certain "reminiscences." These, in the majority of instances, are selected less for their own sake than to furnish a text for "reflections"; and there are several chapters which are simply reflections upon German policy, domestic and foreign. There can be little doubt that Bismarck's chief motive in writing the book was to influence, by his arguments and suggestions, the movement of German policy. In the German as in the English title the *Gedanken*, the reflections, come first. It is probable that this testament will long be cited, not merely because of the authority of his name, but also because of the intrinsic good sense of the counsels he has bequeathed to his people.

In even the most masterly chapters, however—those dealing with international relations—there is a singularly limited horizon. Bismarck discusses European politics as if his little Continent were the world. Great Britain seems merely a neighboring island, and Russia appears to have no interest or existence outside of Europe. That there are other continents; that issues are arising outside of Europe of such magnitude as to dwarf all purely European questions; and that these world issues must reach into and modify the relations of the European states among themselves—of all this, Germany's greatest statesman, who himself started Germany upon a course of colonial experiment, takes no account. The explanation is obvious. In Bismarck's youth the rest of the world exercised no appreciable influence upon Europe. In his manhood this influence was still a negligible quantity. In his old age the partition of the world seemed a commercial rather than a political affair. The ultimate political results lay far beyond the roads his mind was wont to travel. His disregard of world politics is a striking proof of the completeness with which men of action belong to their own time. The present ruler of Germany is a man of incomparably less wisdom than his grandfather's chancellor, but he is (at least in his interests) of our generation.

Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? By W. M. Ramsay. London: Hodder & Stoughton; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Prof. Ramsay here brings new material to bear on the account, given in the Third Gospel, of the birth of Jesus. According to the Evangelist, the birth occurred when Quirinius was governing Syria, and it occurred in Bethlehem because Joseph and Mary went to that city in consequence of a decree of Augustus that all the world should be enrolled. To this account various exceptions have been taken, the chief objections being that Augustus is not known ever to have ordered a general census, and that Quirinius was not governor of Syria at that time. The most important part of Prof. Ramsay's book is his reply to the first of these objections. A few years ago (in 1893) three scholars (Kenyon in *Classical Review*, Wilcken in *Hermes*, Viereck in *Philologus*) announced, independently of one another, the discovery that in Egypt, under the Roman Empire, an enrolment was made every fourteen years. The Egyptian census documents mention the years 62, 90, 104, and so on up to 230 A. D., as years of enrolment; and one, found by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt four or five months ago, gives a year earlier than 50 (held by Ramsay, from the names of the officials mentioned in it, to be the year 20). That this system was extended to Syria, Prof. Ramsay holds to be probable from the statement of Tertullian that the enrolment with which the birth of Christ was connected occurred under Sentius Saturninus (governor B. C. 9-6), and from the testimony of an inscription (recently shown to be genuine) in which it is said that a certain Q. Aemilius Secundus, by order of Quirinius (then governor of Syria), made the census of the population of Apameia.

Prof. Ramsay concludes that Augustus instituted a general census system for the Empire, and that this is the statement in Luke. Reckoning back from A. D. 62 (or from 20) the year B. C. 8 would be an enrolment year. Palestine was a troublesome district, and Augustus, Ramsay suggests, might well have desired to know its military strength. But B. C. 8 is too early for the birth-year, and our author suggests that Herod, knowing that the census would not be palatable to the Jews, obtained a delay of a year, with the further concession that the enrolment, to humor the Jewish national spirit, should be by tribes and families, and not after the Roman fashion. Prof. Ramsay assigns the birth of Jesus to the late summer of 7 or 6 B. C. As to Quirinius, our author holds that he was at that time military leader in Syria; Varus, the Imperial legate proper, was a man without military experience, and, as the country was turbulent, Quirinius, an able and successful general, might have been placed there to preserve order.

These new details of the Imperial system of enrolment are of very great interest, and it seems not improbable that it was instituted by Augustus. It is also true that the Greek present infinitive (*ἀπογράφεσθαι*) may refer to the recurring seasons, or the general rule, of enrolment, and that the title given to Quirinius (*ἡγεμονεύων*) may mean "military leader," or "procurator," and that such an officer might have been charged with the conduct of an enrolment.

It is doubtful whether Prof. Ramsay's special interpretation is permitted by the Greek. When the Evangelist says: "This, as first enrolment, occurred when Q. was procurator (or military governor) of Syria," the word "this" almost certainly refers not to a general law but to a specific edict. The chronological argument is, however, not affected by this point, and Prof. Ramsay's defence of the accuracy of Luke is entitled to consideration, though a final conclusion cannot be reached till more facts have come to our knowledge. Whether his arguments turn out to be valid or not, he has brought together much interesting material. His book is marred here and there by a bitter and unjust tone towards those much-enduring persons, "the critics." On the whole question two obvious remarks suggest themselves: Luke's general credit as historian would not be destroyed by a mistake of a name or a date; and his general credit is not established by proving his accuracy in this particular case.

A Gunner Aboard the "Yankee." Edited by H. H. Lewis, late U. S. Navy. Doubleday & McClure Co. 1898.

This book, which carries with it an introduction by Rear-Admiral Sampson, is the result of the experience of a member of the New York Naval Reserve in the war just closed, and is based upon the personal diary of the anonymous author, who is known on the title-page as No. 5 of the "after-port (5-in.) gun."

The Naval Reserves of the United States have been and are still practically a naval militia of a number of the States, recognized and aided by law, it is true, by the general Government, but, previous to the war, with no official and definite rôle or assignment to duty by the bureau in the Navy Department charged with the care and assignment of the personnel, both enlisted and official, of the navy. Our navy, from its small size and the constant demands made upon it, was, before the war, mobilized up to almost its full strength; its modern construction caused but a small part of its material to be under

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

repair, and there was practically none in ordinary or inactive reserve. This fact, and the busy demands of administrative routine, led to a neglect of preparation for expansion and for the mobilization of the auxiliary naval reserve forces, until the warlike situation and the foresight of the then Assistant Secretary of the Navy induced the necessary measures for a mobilization of the reserves and the general expansion of the navy. Under these circumstances the Naval Reserve force finally received attention and place in the schemes for providing a war navy for offensive and defensive purposes, and the various bodies were then directed to fill their complements and prepare for active service.

The naval authorities who had discussed the rôle of the Naval Reserve, but who lacked the administrative function to place them, had proposed that the reserves should be used to man the vessels that were to form the second or inner line of defence. These vessels, localized as far as possible, were to consist of auxiliary vessels improvised from tugs, yachts, and smaller merchant vessels, of a size and for a duty such that individual intelligence would count for the most, and manual labor and numerical force for the least. This, with the coast signal service and local torpedo-boat work, was and is the rôle of the naval militia as distinguished from the proper and seagoing Naval Reserve. But the war with Spain never became a defensive war of a nature which involved the continuance of a second line of defence, and the vessels, large and small, which were assigned at first to coast-defensive purposes were drawn off gradually for the constantly increasing blockade duty and for the other offensive operations in the West Indies. The few that remained were mostly consigned to the patrol of mine fields and minor auxiliary purposes, or to man the obsolete monitors for harbor defence. Hence a very large portion of the Naval Reserves served in deep-sea vessels, and were drafted into the sphere of active warfare in foreign waters. Although, to a certain extent, the use of this fine personnel to do the duty of the hewers of wood and the drawers of water on board ship was like the using of fine razors to cut blocks, none the less was the work done well and uncomplainingly; and in the reward most eagerly sought after—a brush with the enemy—they showed a spirit as well as a skill and endurance that deserved and received words of high commendation from their commander-in-chief. The men were better than the officers, as a rule, in the Naval Reserves, always excepting the graduates of Annapolis and the few others who had seen service in the merchant marine.

The narrative in this book is from one of the men before the mast and "behind the gun," who was drafted with a number of his fellows of the New York Naval Reserve into the U. S. S. *Yankee*, formerly the Morgan liner *El Norte*. Fortunate in their ship, they were even more fortunate in their commander, one of the best all-round officers in the regular service. The story will be found to be of interest, and is told with a sprightliness and humor that should give it many readers.

It is not probable that in any future war in which the United States may be engaged, an enemy of so little enterprise will be found as Spain proved to be, nor one so sparing in its raids and attacks upon our coast towns and coastwise commerce. Hence it is important that, after the formation of a proper national reserve for the navy, seagoing and with sea experience, sufficient aid should be given to the naval militia of the various States as a supplement to the Naval Reserve for torpedo-boat work, for auxiliary naval purposes, and for the inner line of floating defence. The experience of the late war emphasizes the existence of a distinctively military factor to be found in the panic fears of wealthy and thickly settled sea-coast districts.

The Gods of our Fathers: A Study of Saxon Mythology. By Herman I. Stern. Harpers. 1898. Pp. xxx+269.

Precisely who our fathers would be if they were determined by deduction from this book, it is not possible to surmise. It may be, however, that the author himself had this very fact in mind, for we are a composite people made up fundamentally of all sorts of Germanic elements united into a veritable hodgepodge of descent. As a whole, we should be shown by such an evolution of an ancestor not only to be more Norse than anything else, but to be preponderantly of direct Norse extraction at the time of the Viking age, which it is perfectly plain that most of us are not. The fact that the book is called a study of "Saxon" mythology sheds only an apparent light on the subject. The very first paragraph shows that the author uses "Saxon" in a purely generic sense, in spite of the specific signification that rightly belongs to it, for here there are gods enumerated of whom the Saxons never heard, and, later on, he speaks of Loki as "the Satan of the Saxons," and of Baldur as "the Saxon Christ," though the real Saxons were guiltless of either the one or the other.

The fundamental difficulty in the present book lies just in this heterogeneous character of its material. The author plainly starts out with the assumption that Norse mythology is Germanic—or, as he puts it, "Saxon"—mythology, and that all of it is of equal importance. With this, which from the nature of the case is by far the principal portion of the material that has come down to us from the heathen days of any part of the race, he combines wholly at random anything else he can find among the other Germanic peoples, with no thought of resulting incongruity. He has his drag-net out for things "Saxon," and all is "Saxon" that comes into it. What appears, consequently, from the book to be a mythological system is in reality no system at all, but an *omnium-gatherum* of Germanic mythological matter of all degrees of value, and of all ages and places of origin.

Instances of these processes appear throughout the book. Walhalla, for instance, is described as "the human heaven of the Teutons, a sort of Olympus and Elysium combined," when in reality this was a Norsemen's paradise, wholly a development of the warrior spirit of the Viking age, and one in which the rest of the Teutons had no share. Much of the mythology to be gathered from Norse sources is inherently new and local, and some of it is not, in a proper sense, mythology at all. Although the belief in giants, in this way, as personifications of the forces of nature, is a possession of the whole Germanic people, and one, furthermore, that they shared with the other Indo-Europeans, the giants as we have them from Old Norse sources are purely creations of Northern, and not of Germanic, phantasy. We know, in point of fact, infinitely more about the mythology of the Scandinavian North along broad lines, not merely because our sources of information are fuller and clearer, but in great part for the reason that there was, through special development, infinitely more to know. Yggdrasil, the world tree, for instance, is Germanic, but its whole outfit—the goat, the stag, the deer, the dragon, the eagle, the squirrel—is elements of Eastern-Christian mysticism thus locally associated. There is much, furthermore, in Old Norse sources that is simply to be ascribed to the creative poetic phantasy of the skaldic poets themselves, and that never had any firm lodgment in the religious belief of the people whatever. The author, however, entirely ignores all principles of this sort, which have become veritable truisms to one who has read the literature of the subject.

Besides the uncritical use of material, the book is full of curious misapprehensions. "The realm of Hel," it says, "as an abode of departed spirits, virtually appears only at the close of the Asen dynasty," when, in reality, it is one of the most fundamental conceptions of Northern heathendom. The 'Heimskringla' it calls "a crude attempt at universal history," when, to quote Carlyle, who correctly appreciated its value, it is "to be reckoned among the great history-books of the world." The meaning of "Loki" has nothing to do with *lux;* this god does not "invariably designate the element fire," and he is not "the personification of evil." To correct the faults of statement, however, would be essentially to rewrite the book from title-page to colophon.

At the beginning, in lieu of a dedication, the author prints the following quotation: "It would be an interesting work to show how Norse and Greek Mythologies respectively have colored the religious, social, political, and literary character of Greek and Romance peoples on the one hand and Norsemen and Teutons on the other. Somebody will undoubtedly in due time be inspired to undertake such a task." It need hardly be said that the lists are still open.

John Adams, the Statesman of the American Revolution. With other Essays and Addresses, historical and literary. By Mellen Chamberlain. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1898. Pp. 476.

Under the editorial supervision of Mr. Lindsay Swift, Judge Chamberlain has here brought together a selection of the more important papers and addresses prepared by him for various occasions during the last fifteen years. With two or three exceptions, they deal with subjects in American history and biography, in both of which fields the author has long been a recognized authority. While they by no means represent the sum of Judge Chamberlain's work as a scholar, they serve to exhibit his principles and methods, and his views of the proper standpoint from which to interpret American history. That some of his most original conclusions no longer seem novel, is of itself a gratifying indication of their acceptance by thoughtful students who have gleaned after him.

The initial essay on John Adams, the longest and most important piece in the volume, is a thorough-going examination of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

causes of the Revolution and of the relation of Adams to the constitutional side of the struggle. No writer has set forth more clearly or instructively the nature of the influences which brought about the separation of the American colonies from the mother country. In Judge Chamberlain's view, writs of assistance, the Stamp Act, and the various revenue and coercive measures of Great Britain were the occasion, rather than the cause, of the Revolution. They were irritating and, from the standpoint of political expediency, indefensible, but they only hastened a crisis which, even without them, could not have been permanently averted. The causes of the Revolution lay rather in the inherent temper of the colonists, their English love of freedom and self-government, their jealousy of commercial interference, and their increasing reliance upon their charters as the real constitutional foundation of their government and their political rights. It was the peculiar merit of John Adams that he was one of the first to see the constitutional significance of the contest, and that he led Massachusetts, and through her the other colonies, to a more or less discerning acceptance of his ideas.

In the paper on the "Constitutional Relations of the American Colonies to the English Government," Judge Chamberlain goes over this ground again, with especial reference to the constitutional aspects of the case as presented by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence. While admitting Jefferson's knowledge of the English Constitution as well as his sincerity of purpose, Judge Chamberlain is forced to conclude that, from a constitutional standpoint, the famous indictment of George the Third can hardly stand; on the contrary, "had the King been arraigned on these charges before a court of justice, undoubtedly by advice of counsel he would have demurred to the bill" (p. 155). It was the use of constitutional powers to the injury, and especially to the economic injury, of the colonies that formed the impregnable strength of the American position, and indicated for the colonists their true line of protest; whereas Jefferson, driven to construct a political manifesto which should be at the same time in accord with admitted constitutional principles, missed the point, and framed an indictment of the King which is "perhaps the only one ever drawn in which the real offence is not even mentioned, and where an innocent party was vicariously substituted for the real offender" (p. 158).

We can do no more than to refer very briefly to some of the remaining papers. The one on the "Genesis of the Massachusetts Town," originally part of a formal discussion before the Massachusetts Historical Society, is a vigorous criticism of the theory which connects the town with the contemporary English parish, or ascribes to it such origin and status as are set forth in Alexander Johnston's History of Connecticut. In Judge Chamberlain's view, the origin of the unit of local government in New England is to be sought neither in the forests of Germany nor in the ecclesiastical system of England, but primarily in the special conditions and needs of a new self-governing community in a new world. The Germanic theory in general, and Johnston's application of it in particular, are subjected to further destructive criticism in the "Remarks on the New Historical School," read before the same society at a somewhat earlier date. The paper on "The Authentication of the Declaration of Independence," in itself a model of painstaking and exhaustive research, may be regarded as the final word in the controversy over the date on which the Declaration was signed.

The essential characteristic of Judge Chamberlain's historical method is his reliance upon primary sources of information. His conclusions are invariably the result of exhaustive study of original and contemporary material. He himself confesses, in one or two notes to the present volume, that his, for the moment, neglect of secondary writers has sometimes caused him unnecessary labor, and led him into doing for himself work already satisfactorily done by others. But the invariable citation of chapter and verse in support of his statements, and the constant evidence that his knowledge is based upon first-hand research, give to his historical writings a high and permanent value, and invest his conclusions with a soundness, a freshness, and a defensibleness to which a less exacting worker could not attain. Add to this power of intelligent and patient labor the mental equipment of a trained lawyer and experienced judge, and a clear and forcible style, and we have a scholar whose work, though not large in amount, combines with singular success industrious search for facts, skill and fairness in weighing evidence, and attractiveness of literary form. Of such qualities American historical scholarship can never have too much.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Barry, Rev. William. The Two Standards. Century Co. $1.50.
Cajori, Prof. Florian. A History of Physics. Macmillan. $1.60.
Duff, J. D. Fourteen Satires of Juvenal. Cambridge (Eng.): University Press; New York: Macmillan. $1.50.
Gielow, Martha S. Mammy's Reminiscences, and Other Sketches. A. S. Barnes & Co. $1.
Hardy, Thomas. Wessex Poems, and Other Verses. Harpers. $1.75.
Jones, H. A. The Physician: A Play. Macmillan. 75c.
Kennan, George. Campaigning in Cuba. Century Co. $1.50.
Ladd, Prof. G. T. Essays on the Higher Education. Scribners. $1.
Moulton, Prof. R. G. Bible Stories (Old Testament). (Modern Reader's Bible.) Macmillan.
Nichols, A. B. Lessing's Minna von Barnhelm. Henry Holt & Co. 60c.
Oxenham, John. God's Prisoner. Henry Holt & Co.
Panin, Ivan. Thoughts. Grafton, Mass.: The Author.
Paston, George. A Writer of Books. Appletons. $1.
Raimond, C. E. The Open Question. Harpers. $1.50.
Ross, Albert. That Gay Deceiver. G. W. Dillingham Co. $1.
Sigsbee, Capt. C. D. The Maine. An Account of her Destruction in Havana Harbor. Century Co. $1.50.
Smith, Rev. Hobart. The Garrison Church, Baltimore Co., Md. New York: James Pott & Co.
Smyth, Prof. A. H. Pope's Iliad of Homer. Books I., VI., XXII., XXIV. Macmillan. 25c.
Spencer, Rev. F. A. The Four Gospels. A New Translation. W. H. Young & Co. $1.50.
The Autobiography of Charles H. Spurgeon. Vol. II. 1854-1860. F. H. Revell Co. $2.50.
"The Georgian Period." Measured Drawings of Colonial Work. Parts II. and III. American Architect and Building News Co.
The Judgment of Socrates. A Translation from Plato. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 15c.
Wright, Prof. W. Grammar of the Arabic Language: 3d ed., revised. Vol. II. Cambridge (Eng.): University Press; New York: Macmillan.

"Literature," says of Prof. Beers' "English Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century" (Henry Holt & Co., New York. 12mo. $2): "The author presents in himself a rare combination—a scholarly and historical knowledge, which places at his command a seemingly inexhaustible fund of literary *data*, and a keen and appreciative literary taste. The style of the book is happily easy, and a certain characteristic humor runs pleasantly between many of the lines. . . . The author is always interesting and lucid, his analyses are clear and profound, and his lighter details of literary happenings are often delightfully amusing. The book is a notable example of the best type of unpedantic literary scholarship."

JUST PUBLISHED:

The Polish Rider

BY REMBRANDT.

A fine photogravure, reproduced directly from the original painting in the collection of Count Tarnowski, measuring 16x18 inches, on van Gelder paper, $5 00.

Illustrated special Catalogue of our Standard Series of MASTERPIECES OF ANCIENT ART MAILED on receipt of 10 cents in stamps.

BERLIN PHOTOGRAPHIC CO. 14 E. 23d St., NEW YORK.

READY FEBRUARY 10th.

The Heart of Denise

AND OTHER TALES.

By S. LEVETT YEATS, Author of "The Chevalier d'Auriac," "The Honour of Savelli," etc. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo, cloth, ornamental, $1.25.

"Mr. Levett Yeats, as a writer of romantic fiction, is to be ranked abreast of Mr. Weyman, and, in some respects, ahead of his more prolific fellow author."—*Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia.*

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.,

91-93 Fifth Ave., New York.

Harnack's History of Dogma, Vol. V. ($2.50), containing an exposition of the life and doctrines of Augustine, has just been issued by **Little, Brown and Company, Boston.**

BOOKS FOR SCARCE ONES CONSULT **POOR RICHARD'S ALMANACK,** gratis. BOX 4037, STATION B, PHILADELPHIA.

AUTOGRAPH LETTERS of Famous People bought and sold by WALTER R. BENJAMIN, 1125 Broadway, New York City. Send for price-list.

Roman Africa

Archæological Walks in Algiers and Tunis. By GASTON BOISSIER. With 4 Maps. Large 12mo, $1.75.

M. Boissier needs no introduction to an American public. Those who have read his previous books are already familiar with the simplicity and clearness of his style, and realize that his work is based upon a foundation of thorough scholarly knowledge.

Fresh impressions of the earlier works of Gaston Boissier.

Cicero and His Friends.....$1 75
Rome and Pompeii..... 2 50
The Country of Horace and Virgil..... 2 00

A companion work to the above.

The Riviera, Ancient and Modern. By C. LENTHÉRIC.....$2 00

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK—LONDON.

PHOTOGRAPHS AND CARBONS

of Architecture, Sculpture, and Paintings of all European Galleries imported by

GEORGE BUSSE, 12 W. 28th St., New York

ARTISTIC FRAMING.

London Weekly Circular of Rare Books Issued every Saturday. Sent gratis by **H. W. HAGEMANN, 160 5th Ave., New York.**

BOOKS, SECOND-HAND AND NEW, Standard and Rare. Books bought. Catalogues issued. E. W. JOHNSON, 2 E. 42d St., N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED